

To My Family

**INTERNALIZATION OF EUROPEAN MINORITY NORMS:
THE CASE OF GREECE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION**

**THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
BILKENT UNIVERSITY**

BY

DİDEM EKİNCİ

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

IN

**THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
BILKENT UNIVERSITY
ANKARA**

SEPTEMBER 2002

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Asst. Prof. Gülgün Tuna

Supervisor

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Asst. Prof. Hasan Ünal

Examining Committee Member

I certify that I have read this thesis and have found that it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of International Relations.

Assoc. Prof. Tahire Erman

Examining Committee Member

Approval of the Institute of Economics and Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Kürşat Aydoğan

Director

ABSTRACT

INTERNALIZATION OF EUROPEAN MINORITY NORMS: THE CASE OF GREECE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Didem Ekinçi

M.A., Department of International Relations

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Gülgün Tuna

September 2002

Coexistence of different ethnicities and cultural groups within the boundaries of Europe have come to be the subject matter of serious arguments of minority-related debates in the Continent to date, some of which have been translated into a series of institutional arrangements. These arrangements, relatively insufficiently embraced in earlier times, gave way to a broader yet compact arrangement by the European Union which is open to signature also by non-member states. However, due to the lack of value-free practices regarding minorities, certain “legally” European states such as Greece seem to prefer to adhere to nationhood-oriented policies whereby one state, one culture, one people is taken to be the norm. Given this mindset, the minorities in Greece are seen by the Greek state as supposed to be outside the borders, letting alone their peripheral locations. Although at a time when even non-member states strive to partake in the related affairs of the Union, close examination reveals that due to the strong and intrinsic existence of Greek nationalism encompassing its specific ingredients of religion, language, the imported belief that Greece sets a model civilization before all other nations, and similar Western intellect influence, Greece has come to deny the existence of its minority groups which this thesis seeks to examine in four parts. Based on such framework, it is seen with further elaboration by this thesis that within an unlimited time span, Greek minority policies and those of Europe display a discordant image, though the country is declared “European” by both Europe and itself.

Keywords: Minorities in Greece, Greek minority policies, European minority norms, Greek nationalism

ÖZET

AVRUPA AZINLIK NORMLARININ BENİMSENMESİ: AVRUPA BİRLİĞİ İÇİNDE YUNANİSTAN ÖRNEĞİ

Didem Ekinci

Yüksek Lisans, Uluslararası İlişkiler Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Yrd. Doç. Dr. Gülgün Tuna

Eylül 2002

Avrupa sınırları içinde farklı etnik ve kültürel grupların karşılıklı olarak mevcudiyetleri, kıtada bir dizi kurumsal düzenlemenin oluşturulmasına yol açan azınlık konulu tartışmaların özünü oluşturma gelmiştir. Daha önceleri nispeten yeterince benimsenememiş bu düzenlemeler ise üye olmayan ülkelerin imzasına da açık olan, Birliğin daha geniş fakat daha kapsamlı bir düzenleme oluşturmaya zemin hazırlamıştır. Ancak, temelinde değer yargıları bulunmayan azınlık politikalarının oluşturulamamış olmasından dolayı, Yunanistan gibi bazı “hukuken” Avrupalı devletler, tek ülke, tek kültür, tek halkın norm olarak alındığı ulus-temelli politikalara bağlı kalmayı tercih eder görünmektedirler. Dolayısıyla, Yunanistan’da azınlıklar, ikinci sınıf konumları bir yana, ülkenin sınırları dışında olmaları gerektiği biçiminde algılanmaktadır. Günümüzde üye olmayan ülkelerin dahi AB’nin ilgili düzenlemelerinde yer almaya gayret etmelerine rağmen, etraflı incelemeler göstermektedir ki güçlü ve köklü Yunan milliyetçiliği ve içinde barındırdığı din ve dil öğeleri ile, batıdan ihraç edilmiş olan, Yunanistan’ın bütün diğer uluslar için bir örnek oluşturduğu inancı ve benzeri Batı düşüncesi etkileri nedeniyle Yunanistan, bu tezde de dört bölümde ele alındığı üzere, azınlıkların inkarı politikasını benimseye gelmiştir. Bu çerçevede, detaylarıyla bu tezde de görülmektedir ki, herhangi bir zaman dilimi sınırlaması olmaksızın, gerek Yunanistan ve gerekse Avrupa tarafından “Avrupalı” olarak tanımlanmasına rağmen, Yunanistan Avrupa’nın azınlık politikalarına uyum sağlayan bir tablo sergilememektedir.

Keywords: Yunanistan’da azınlıklar, Yunan azınlık politikaları, Avrupa azınlık normları, Yunan milliyetçiliği

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My deepest and most special gratitude is reserved for Asst. Prof. Gülgün Tuna for her immeasurable guidance and support throughout this thesis. The most supportive and encouraging figure before me since my early Bilkent days, she provided the stimulus for my interest in research and guided me in my education life with her immense knowledge, tolerance and patience.

I am grateful to Asst. Prof. Hasan Ünal who introduced me to the topic, encouraged me to proceed with further research, examined my thesis and participated in my oral defense exam.

Due acknowledgment is to Assoc. Prof. Tahire Erman who analyzed my thesis and partook in my oral defense exam with her valuable comments.

I am indebted to all my friends, especially to Hasret Atalay and Esra Özçelik, who supported me sincerely with sympathy at good and hard times throughout my thesis.

Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to my family, especially to my mother who has always been there for me with her deep belief and trust in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZET.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF MINORITIES AND	
MINORITY PROTECTION IN EUROPE.....	5
1.1 Emergence of the Idea and Identity of Europe.....	5
1.2 Defining Minorities in Europe.....	8
1.3 The History of Minority Protection in Europe.....	11
1.4 The League of Nations and Minority Protection.....	12
1.5 The United Nations and Its Minority Regime.....	14
1.6 The Council of Europe and Minority Protection.....	16
1.7 OSCE and Protection of Minority Rights.....	21
CHAPTER II: EVOLUTION OF NATIONALISM IN GREECE	
AND GREEK NATIONAL IDENTITY.....	24
2.1 The Nature of the Concept “Barbarian”: Us vs. Them.....	29
2.2 Religion Unity.....	32
2.3 The Persian Wars.....	35

2.4 Citizen and Alien.....	37
2.5 The Roman Influence.....	40
2.6 The Byzantine Period.....	40
2.7 Greek Identity Under Ottoman Rule.....	45

CHAPTER III: POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF GREECE

WITH RESPECT TO ITS MINORITIES.....	49
3.1 Overview of the Situation.....	49
3.2 Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Greece.....	51
3.3 Turks in Greece.....	54
3.4 Macedonians in Greece.....	65
3.5 Albanians in Greece.....	72
3.6 Vlachs in Greece (Koutsovlachs or Aromanians).....	79
3.7 Pomaks in Greece.....	80
3.8 The Roma (Gypsies) in Greece.....	82
3.9 Jews in Greece.....	83

CHAPTER IV: ANALYTICAL EVALUATION OF GREECE'S

MINORITY-RELATED POLICIES.....	87
4.1 The Greek Media: Breeding Hatred?.....	88
4.2 Civil Society and Democracy in Greece.....	91

CONCLUSION: PROSPECT FOR GREECE IN THE EU: DISCORD

CONVERGENCE?.....	94
-------------------	----

APPENDICES.....	96
Appendix A: Framework Convention For The Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe.....	96
Appendix B: Treaty of Lausanne - Articles 37-45.....	100
Appendix C: Two Emergency Orders by the General Administration of Thrace.....	103
Appendix D: Reply by the Office of Town-Planning of the Prefecture of Rhodope to the Managing Committee of the Muslim Temple in the Village of Sembola.....	104
Appendix E: A Selective List of Lands and Cemeteries Expropriated by Greece.....	105
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	108

INTRODUCTION

Complex and politicized, the question of minorities is echoed present in the agenda of European Union today. The issue indeed necessitates thorough analysis and description, as the history and continuity of minority groups in Europe are observed to differ in state- and self-descriptions, demographic settlements and figures; and their underlying reasons.

Though one might assert that the national sentiment is not supposed to make itself be felt in this simultaneously supranational, international and intergovernmental polity as a requirement of integration philosophy, it indeed is traced as coming to fore as further elaborated in this thesis, exemplifying the situation in Greece.

In general, a multifold collection of factors seem to operate before the relevant policies and practices of Greece, which as a whole seem to serve to the preservation of Greek nationalism. Religion and language being the two most influential and dominant arguments regarding the issue, the remaining - and supplementing - ones such as the “uniqueness of the Greek nation” with its universally accepted status created by Romantic Western intellect, and the due presumption that Greece has set the clock of civilization ticking can be argued as adding to the “accepted superiority” of the Greek nation.

Such a deep-rooted strand of thought has come to preserve its presence and is seen as operating against the country's minorities even today, though it should seem remote to today's realities.

Notwithstanding the arrangements provided in Europe to date; the European Union is observed to present itself as a platform that is supposed to handle the question of minorities within its boundaries; alongside with other domestic issues which have become international. A tacit result is the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities of the Council of Europe, which is the most compact but detailed arrangement to date in the Continent.

Though not perfect, close analysis would show that the Convention is flexible in nature, in that, it is geared to protect and promote minority rights within member states, emphasizing state sovereignty on the other hand, and grants the member states the right to identify for themselves their own minorities.

Yet, Greece falls out from the signatory list due to an amalgam of intertwined range of factors which are described in their length in the succeeding sections. The aim of this thesis is thus to describe how European perceptions of minority have come to evolve in the Continent's history and; how Greece, accepted as a European country, has manifest a discordant image in time as regards the issue.

The material gathered on related literature are observed to verify one another; as no significant change is reported since times as early as Antiquity to present day. As extensive collection of sources approve, the basic assertion on Greece's end remain

unchanged: the Greek belief that Greece has been and is homogeneous in demographic structure, and that there has not been any intermingling with neighboring nations.

Within this framework, the first chapter provides a historical account on minorities in the history of Europe, stretching as far back as to mythic times within space limitations, exemplifying later minority arrangements and their nature; together with contemporary ones, highlighting how and why these arrangements were formulated and failed to prove successful in earlier times.

The second chapter is a preparatory connection to better understand its succeeding section; in that, it goes through the evolution of nationalism in Greece initially traced in city-state times; later during the Roman conquest, the Byzantium, the Ottoman rule and finally in modern Greek state, and; would help comprehend that Greek nationalism has in fact deeper roots than acknowledged.

The third chapter is devoted to description of minority groups and their situation in Greece, supplemented by as many concrete examples as possible both from history and recent developments; those contemporary minority groups being the Turks, the Macedonians, the Albanians, the Vlachs, the Pomaks, the Roma and the Jews.

The fourth chapter constitutes a general analytical evaluation of the situation with its emphasis on civil society and media in Greece as two negatively contributing factors on the situation of minorities in Greece.

In conclusion final remarks endorse in brief what has been inferred in preceding sections and conclude that through more democratic involvement and social learning, positive modifications might well be provided in the future on the issue.

CHAPTER I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF MINORITIES AND MINORITY PROTECTION IN EUROPE

1.1 EMERGENCE OF THE IDEA AND IDENTITY OF EUROPE

“Europe must be judged by how it treats its minorities...”
(Gerard Delanty, 1995:15)

The cultural idea of Europe emerged as embedded in Christendom, which had become coterminous with the notion of the Occident, that essentially preceded the idea of Europe, nevertheless the idea in question had quite different a meaning for the ancients in terms of politics or culture, as it was more related to the domain of myths. That is, “Europa” was the name of a woman who had power of mystification in Greek myths.¹ Seduced by Zeus, Europa, the Phoenician princess, left her homeland which is present day Lebanon and came to Crete where she later married the Cretan King and thus, it can be suggested that not being a highly differentiated concept,

¹ see Gerard Delanty, Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality (London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1995), pp.16-29, where the author cites Denys Hay inter alia on the origins of the idea of Europe and Greek myths on the issue.

“Europe” was not a Greek discovery, but a Phoenician one, since many Greek myths cite “Europe” as the sister of Asia and Libya (the ancient name of Africa).²

In the reflections of many Greek intellectuals such as Aristotle, Plato or Herodotus, it appears that Asia and the remainder territory beyond Hellas were of little significance to the Greeks for whom everything non-Greek was simply “barbarian”, not in the present pejorative sense but denoting “non-Greekness”. With regard to geographical distinction, Toynbee³ argues that according to Hippocrates, the Sea of Azov was the boundary between Asia and Europe and for Herodotus, there was no clear distinction between Asia and Europe and the north of the Black Sea was named “Scythia” and Ptolemy used the term “Sarmatia” and distinguished between “Sarmatia Europea” and “Sarmatia Asiatica” with River Don separating them.⁴ Toynbee further maintains that the Greeks not always considered themselves as “Europeans” and what was significant was the presence of lesser opposition of Europe versus other realities, peoples and cultures than today.⁵

Whatever viewpoint on the emergence of European identity might be adopted, it can be maintained that the early history of the idea of Europe reveals different approaches as to whether Europe is merely a geographical construct or a cultural political idea. It might also be suggested that with later presuppositions invented by western intellect asserting that Greece had set the clock of civilization ticking, the

² Ibid. The author cites Sattler and Bernal as regards the later invention that was created to fabricate European cultural image whose roots lay in ancient Greece that bore no recognition of its roots in the Orient.

³ Arnold Toynbee, Asia and Europe. Facts and Fantasies, In A Study of History (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), pp.708-729.

⁴ Delanty, Inventing Europe, pp.16-29. Although the author does not offer any possible meaning of the term itself, it would be inferred that the word had a meaning related with “land” or “territory”.

early history of the idea of Europe entails a lesser degree of tension in terms of both identifying and treating the alien territories and cultures. However, as acknowledged, the political-cultural dualism with which the idea of Europe was linked was Christendom versus Islam in the aftermath of the early history of Europe⁶, and it can be asserted that by the eleventh century, the idea in question had well evolved from a mere geographical expression to a cultural issue.

Viewed in retrospect, as Larkin asserts, by the fourth century The Christian Church had emerged as the official and sole religious identity of the Roman Empire manifesting considerable tolerance in terms of religion nevertheless, with the Crusades beginning in 1095, discrimination came to fore whereby Muslims and Jews were perceived as threats to the Church. To give but a couple of examples, the Fourth Lateran Council introduced a policy in 1215 restricting Jews into ghettos and regulating their dress. And, kings occasionally indulged in mass expulsion of Jews as King Edward of England did in 1290.⁷ The picture posed by the Roman Church in terms of intolerance took an intensified form in the Middle Ages wherein Europe introduced special tribunals to torture “heretic” elements of Jews, Muslims and eventually Protestants. Nevertheless, with the Protestant upheaval, emanating as Reformation in the sixteenth century followed by the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, minority rights issues emerged within the scope of intellectual reasoning which essentially rejected oppression of minorities. Eventually, with the 1789 French Revolution, and the consequent nineteenth century demonstrated more

⁵ Toynbee, Asia and Europe, Facts and Fantasies, In A Study of History , pp.711.

⁶ Delanty, Inventing Europe, pp20-29.

concern on the issue⁸, with ethnic and linguistics minorities, which still occupies place in the Continent's politics as a consequence of the permanent settlement in the European territories and due encounter between the peoples of Europe.

1.2 DEFINING MINORITIES IN EUROPE

As a ramification of the encounter between the settlers in Europe and the indigenous peoples, the decades-old reflections and formulations so as to find a proper definition for the term “minority” have invoked attention and diligence on the subject to date, however; a generally accepted definition failed to materialize due to the lack in terms of political will on the part of the states to take effective steps on the issue. As the issue is highly politicized, highlighting a couple of legal-political approaches to the term might offer tools to comprehend the word at the first stage along with various viewpoints on the question.

An attempt by the United Nations in the twentieth century to define the term “minority” is seen in the 1985 meeting of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities. In the deliberations, the definition put forward read:

⁷ LaRae Larkin, The Legitimacy in International Law of the Detention and Internment of Aliens and Minorities in the Interest of National Security, Symposium Series, vol. 40 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1996), pp.33-35.

⁸ Ibid.

A group of citizens of a state, constituting a numerical minority and in a non-dominant position in that State, endowed with ethnic, religious or linguistic characteristics which differ from those of the majority of the population, having a solidarity with one another, motivated, if only implicitly, by a collective will to survive and whose aim is to achieve equality with the majority in fact and in law.⁹

The Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly adopted Recommendation 1201 (1993) for an additional protocol of the minority rights to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The proposal for this protocol defines minorities as follows:

For the purpose of this Convention the expression “national minority refers to a group of persons in a state who

- a) reside on the territory of that state and are citizens thereof,
- b) maintain long standing, firm and lasting ties with that state,
- c) display distinctive ethnic, cultural, religious or linguistic characteristics,
- d) are sufficiently representative, although smaller in number than rest of the population of that state,
- e) are motivated by a concern to preserve together that which constitutes their common identity, including their culture, their traditions, their religion or their language.¹⁰

In contrast to UN and Council of Europe definitions, no agreement could be reached within the OSCE on the definition of minority. Yet, although at first sight, the results of this lack are not easily predictable, it is sometimes alleged that there is a silent, practical consensus in the OSCE that the concept “minority” concerns “a non-dominant group which constitutes a numerical minority within a state.”¹¹

⁹ United Nations E/CN.4/Sub.2/1985/31, para. 181.

¹⁰ Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, EREC 1201. WP, 1403-1/2/93-17-E, pp.3.

¹¹ Kristin Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2000), pp.27-30

As regards individual interpretations, Panayi underscores the minorities in Europe as “...‘subcultures’ maintaining some or all of the behavioral characteristics that in some degree, set them off from society’s mainstream or modal culture”¹², these behavioral characteristics being appearance, language and religion. Also, Eriksen, from an anthropological angle, defines minorities as such: “An ethnic minority can be defined as a group which is numerically inferior to the rest of the population in a society, which is politically non-dominant and which reproduced as an ethnic category.”¹³

Indeed, the definitions of minorities do point out the common aforementioned characteristics of minorities, though not matching with one another in their entirety. Still it would not be a fallacy to argue that these definitions and many others¹⁴ address the issue at its core; as many minority settlements within Europe with their deep-rooted history manifest the mentioned common characteristics in due course of their coming into terms as they inhabited Europe.

¹² Panikos Panayi, An Ethnic History of Europe Since 1945 (Essex: Longman, 2000), pp. 9.

¹³ Thomas Hylland Eriksen, Ethnicity and Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives (London: Pluto Press, 1993), pp. 121. For the definition of the term see Ivan Gyurcsik, “New Legal Ramifications of the Question of National Minorities-Introduction” in Minorities: The New Europe’s Old Issue, Ian M. Cuthbertson and Jane Leibowitz eds. (Colorado: Westview Press, 1993), pp.19-53; also see Roen Koch, “The International Community and Forms of Intervention in the Field of Minority Rights Protection” in *ibid*, pp.253-272; Cathie Lloyd, “National Approaches to Immigration and Minority Policies” in Ethnic Mobilization in a Multi-Cultural Europe, John Rex and Beatrice Drury eds. (Ipswich: Ipswich Book Co Ltd., 1994-1996), pp.69-77; see Sharon MacDonald, “Identity Complexes in Western Europe: Social Anthropological Perspectives” in Inside European Identities, Sharon MacDonald ed. (Province/Oxford: Berg, 1993), pp.1-26. For a detailed discussion of the term, see Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection. See inter alia, Serge Moscovici “Innovation and Minority Influence” in Perspectives on Minority, Serge Moscovici, Gabriel Mugny, Eddy van Avermaet eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp.9-48; Natan Lerner, “The Evolution of Minority Rights in International Law” in Peoples and Minorities in International Law, Catherine Bröllmann et al. eds. (The Hague: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993), pp.77-101; see also Patrick Thornberry, “Images of Autonomy and Individual and Collective Rights in International Instruments on the Rights of Minorities” in Autonomy: Applications and Implications, Markku Suksi ed. (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1998), pp. 97-124; see idem, “International and European Standards on Minority Rights” in Minority Rights in Europe: The Scope for a Transnational Regime, Hugh Miall ed. (London: Pinter Publishers, 1994), pp.19.

By way of conclusion, it can be inferred that there is no general agreement on a standard definition of “minority”, at either the international or European level. If an optimistic view is to be developed regarding this lack or the disagreement on the thorough components of minority definition, it can be argued that only the discussion of disagreements might give way to improved insight on the width of the concept.¹⁵

1.3 THE HISTORY OF MINORITY PROTECTION IN EUROPE

The idea of creating a set of norms and values for treatment of minorities in Europe is not a new phenomenon.¹⁶ As Ryan argues, Capotorti is known to have traced the history of minority protection in Europe as far back as the 1606 Treaty of Vienna, which had provisions relating to the treatment of the Protestant minorities in Hungary.¹⁷ Several treaties then included provisions which were concerned with the protection of minorities.¹⁸ To cite a few, these include the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia, the 1660 Treaty of Oliva, the 1678 Treat of Nijmegen, the 1763 Treaty

¹⁴ see footnote 13 above.

¹⁵ Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.30.

¹⁶ Stephen Ryan, Ethnic Conflict and International Relations (Vermont: Dartmouth, 1990), pp. 152-153.

¹⁷ see *ibid.*, where Ryan cites Capotorti, the Special Rapporteur (along with Deschenes) of the UN Working Group on Minorities of UN Sub-Commission; see also the relevant document UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub2/384; see Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.18-25.

¹⁸ Due to autocratic elements in the related period's fashion of administration, the focal point in determining a minority type stood as religion. Yet, there evolved numerous types of minorities in the course of history, concurrent with new types of states and new types of governing styles. For a thorough account of minority types, visit www.bsos.umd.edu/cidcm/mar, where Ted Robert Gurr of Maryland University provides a long list of them, though the examples for the categories do not always seem to match, most probably due to subjective interpretations on the issue; see also Panayi, An Ethnic History of Europe Since 1945, pp. 10-13.

of Paris, the 1815 Treaty of Vienna, the 1856 Treaty of Paris and 1878 Treaty of Berlin.¹⁹

However, the minority protection regime implemented after the Great War stands different from the abovementioned treaties in view of several respects. First and foremost, the scope of the definition of a minority presented itself with a broader range than that of the hitherto cases; in that, linguistic and national minorities were added on to the religious minorities. Secondly, the guarantor role passed from sovereign states to the League of Nations. Thirdly, The League of Nations established a minorities section (though not as much refined as that of the UN today), which could for the first time provide permanent supervision of the treatment of minorities in the designated states. And finally, a judicial element was introduced to the process of protection by the role that was envisaged for the Permanent Court of International Justice.²⁰

In view of the League of Nations and United Nations systems of minority protection, the next section shall deal with the relevant formulations of minority treatment of each of these organizations.

1.4 THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND MINORITY PROTECTION

¹⁹ see Patrick Thornberry, International Law and Rights of Minorities, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp.25-35, for a detailed overview of the content of these treaties.

²⁰ see Gyurcsik, “Ramifications of the Question of National Minorities-Introduction”, pp.19-52; Ryan, Ethnic Conflict and International Relations; and Lerner, “The Evolution of Minority Rights in International Law”, pp.85.

As Thornberry argues, Woodrow Wilson, the former president of the U.S.A, acknowledged the need for an arrangement of minority protection in the immediate aftermath of the Great War and took due role to voice the issue in an international forum: The League of Nations²¹. And as of 1923, when the system can be said to be operating fully, it envisaged seven legal stages concerning minorities which can be outlined as:

- a) right to petition the League if members of minorities felt their rights were not respected by governments,
- b) acceptance of the petition by the League minorities section,
- c) request by the League to the government concerned that they comment on the petition,
- d) passing the petition and comments by the concerned government to the League Council,
- e) designating an ad hoc committee to consider the documents,
- f) forwarding the recommendation of the ad hoc committee to the Council. The stages so far constituted the automatic procedure.
- g) Yet, this stage did not. At this stage it was upon the inclination of a Council member to get issue raised during a formal session.²²

Moreover, the League system was not intended for general application although it was designated as having “international” spirit; that is, it reflected European history and politics as it was based mainly on treaties signed following the Great War between European states. To give but few examples, treatment of minorities in

²¹ Thornberry, International Law and Rights of Minorities, pp.38.

Bulgaria was based mainly on the 1919 Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine. In similar fashion, treatment of minorities in Greece was arranged by the 1920 Treaty of Sevres.²³

However, in connection with the general malaise seen in the interbellum period, the world witnessed a retrogression of morals and politics, emergence of dictatorships harnessing extreme nationalism and erasing infant international cooperation, from which the minorities would also receive their share. Just as on many issues, the League system reflected unwillingness on resolution of minority conflicts. Yet, the League did occasionally present itself with success.²⁴ To conclude, it can be maintained that as much of the deliberations and sessions were carried out in secret and no minutes were ever kept, a full analysis of the League of Nations' involvement can be labeled as almost unreachable.

1.5 THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS MINORITY REGIME

By the time when attention was being focused on what form the new organization for the replacement of the League of Nations would take, discussions emerged about

²² Walter Simons, International Public Law in Europe: The Evolution of International Public Law in Europe Since Grotius (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931), pp. 96-118.

²³ For other treaties which served as basis for the purpose of preparing an arrangement of minority protection in The League of Nations, see *ibid.*, pp. 41-42.

²⁴ The League for instance was able to stop the eviction of German farmers and upheld a complaint that Jewish entry to intellectual professions was being restricted. It was able to reverse an attempt by Romania to take over control of the local administration in the Magyar district of Szekler. Also, it succeeded in obtaining compensation for Russians on Mount Athos after the Greek Government expropriated an amount of land in the region; see Ryan, Ethnic Conflict and International Relations for further details on how and why a full support for the related regime would not materialize with examples of the time concerning (1919-1939).

whether a similar regime to protect minorities should be created in United Nations, however the UN's attention relating to the issue came to fore as belated as 1978.²⁵ The UN conducted its related studies within the "Sub-Commission on Prevention of the Discrimination and Protection of Minorities" which was established in 1947.²⁶ Within this unit, slow progress was achieved and furthermore the UN Charter did in no shape or form of wording make a reference to the word "minority".²⁷ However, in 1990 a notable change was observed wherein European states particularly Russia and Belarus manifest considerable interest in discussing the issue.²⁸

As a result of this inclination towards bringing the issue to open discussion, by December 1991, the UN Declaration regarding minority rights was approved and promulgated by the General Assembly on 18 December 1992 which read:

...Democracy within nations requires respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as set forth in the Charter. It requires, as well, a deeper understanding and respect for the rights of minorities and respect for the needs of the more vulnerable groups of society, especially women and children. (emphasis added)²⁹

²⁵ Alan Phillips, "Minority Rights: Some Governmental Approaches in Europe" in Scapegoats and Actors: The Exclusion and Integration of Minorities in Western and Eastern Europe, Daniele Joly ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998), pp.119.

²⁶ Theo van Boven, "A Runaway Train or a Re-orient Express? A Response to US Criticism of the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities" in Broadening the Frontiers of Human Rights Essays in Honor of Asbjörn Eide, Donna Gomien ed. (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1993), pp.13.

²⁷ Charter of the UN and Statute of the International Court of Justice, Department of Public Information, (New York: UN, 1997), October 1997, 75M.

²⁸ see Phillips, "Minority Rights: Some Governmental Approaches in Europe", where the author further argues that effective NGO lobbying played a crucial role in creating such a momentum; see also idem, "Minority Rights in Europe", in www.goecities.com/Athens/Delphi/6509/Warwick.htm (November 1995)

²⁹ Phillips, "Minority Rights: Some Governmental Approaches in Europe"; Phillips cites UN Secretary General, Agenda for Peace, September 1992, pp.46 and reviews several other article excerpts concerning the usage of the term "minority", such as from the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights when analyzing the employment of the word in retrospect, and Final Statement of the OSCE Human Dimension meeting in Copenhagen, (June 1990).

It can be argued that while the UN's studies concerning minorities progressively benefited from a trend towards more transparency and openness which led to frequent discussions of the issue, the issue itself could not remain unpoliticized due to the presence of 26 expert members in the Sub-Commission, surrounded by approximately 100 government observers and even by a larger number of NGO representatives.³⁰

By way of conclusion, it can be posited that the Sub-Commission might take progressive steps provided that it embarks in an adjustment process. Indeed, as van Boven put it, "Certain steps have been taken in this direction"³¹ yet, more is needed when dealing with any possible gross problems as in the case of Bosnia.

1.6 THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE AND MINORITY PROTECTION

The Framework Convention for the Protection of the Council of Europe³² can be regarded as a belated result of the changes after 1989 in Europe. As Gal asserts, the Framework Convention is a milestone in converting the political declarations and

³⁰ see van Boven, "A Runaway Train or a Re-orient Express? A Response to US Criticism of the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities", pp.17-19.

³¹ Ibid.

³²(Hereinafter referred to as the "Framework Convention") The Framework Convention was adopted by the Committee of members of the Council of Europe on 10 November 1994. It was opened for signature on 1 February 1995 and it entered into force on 1 February 1998 following the required number of ratification which was 12. The number of signatures not followed by ratifications is 8, while the number of ratifications is 34 (data as of 22 November 2001). Among full members of the European Union, France is the only state which did not sign the Framework Convention. Greece signed it on 22 September 1997, however it did not ratify; see Kinga Gal, "The Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and its Impact on Central and Eastern Europe", *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, (Winter 2000), pp.2, in <http://ecmi.de>, European Center for Minority Issues. For a complete account of the current status of

intents into legal terms, thus becoming the first legally binding international instrument generally devoted to minority protection which shall be elaborated infra.

However, on the way to understanding the urgent need to overcome divisions and conflicts in Europe, the Council of Europe indeed has a longer history dating back to its early days of establishment after World War II. Though seen in the context of human rights at the time, the Council's mission was perceived primarily as "...to achieve a greater unity between its member states,.....on the basis of a specific political project: the commitment of member states and their peoples to the principles of a pluralist democracy, human rights and rule of law.”³³

In view of such an understanding, the project which the Council of Europe set about acknowledged the existence of diversity of peoples as part of Europe's common experience; nevertheless the political structure of Europe until 1989 did not possess the means as to reach out also to the closed societies of Europe. However as of 1989, it began to gradually open up its structures and activities to all the states of the region.

The main objective of the Council of Europe is seen in the “European Convention on Human Rights” of 1950, wherein the rights of minorities were also secured essentially by employing the term “everyone” and not expressions such as “people,

the Convention, visit <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/EN/searcsig.asp?NT=157&cm1&DF=>; also see <http://stars.coe.fr/gen/aintro/htm>.

³³ Klaus Schumann, “The Role of the Council of Europe” in Minority Rights in Europe: The Scope for a Transnational Regime, Hugh Miall ed. (London: Pinter Publishers, 1994), pp.87.

public, citizen” and the like, particularly observed in Articles 9, 10, 11 Additional Protocol, Article 2.³⁴

Against this background, the European Commission for Democracy through law known as the “Venice Commission”, a unit consisting of eminent jurist and constitutional experts set up in 1989 under the aegis of the Council of Europe took the initiative to examine the proposal for a draft European Convention for the Protection of minorities. Nevertheless, after lengthy discussions and deliberations, the Council , in October 1993, in Vienna, agreed to call for a new framework convention in order to assure the protection of minorities, which would also be open for signature by non-member states.

On the other hand, an idea for protection of regional or minority languages was proposed by the Standing Conference of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe, which drew the draft of the Charter of European Regional or Minority Languages which was subsequently adopted in June 1992 by the Committee of ministers.³⁵

As Henrard asserts, in examining the characteristics of the Charter, it is remarkable that “...the Charter does not grant any rights to speakers of certain (minority) languages or to certain linguistic groups but is focused on the languages themselves,

³⁴ see *ibid.*, pp.90 for these articles.

³⁵ The Charter entered into force on 1 March 1998; for further reading see Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.217; also see Maria Amor Martin Estébanez, “The Protection of National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities” in The European Union and Human Rights, Nanette A. Neuwahl and Allan Rosas eds. (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1995); on a thorough and compact examination of the educational, linguistic, cultural, regional development policies of the European Union such as SOCRATES (education program), LINGUA (language education program), LEADER II (rural development program) and possibilities to project these on minorities of different member-states.

and thus on a recognition, protection and promotion of multilingualism.”³⁶ (brackets original).

Secondly, the Charter envisages that the Contracting states can within a certain framework choose their obligations a la carte, thus leaving so much choice to member-states. As this naturally denotes each member-state can determine itself which languages are minority languages in their territory.³⁷

The contribution of the Charter to minority protection seems to be modulated and balanced in view of its flexibility as regards state’s choosing its options. In general, the Charter offers guidelines to member-states on the fashion to deal with the issues of accommodation of linguistic diversity and it confirms the importance of multiculturalism, including multilingualism.³⁸

Turning to the Framework Convention for the Protection of Minorities, through close analysis, it can be seen that several articles of the Framework Convention take up human rights articles of the European Charter of Human Rights while introducing at times extra requirements for securing minority rights.³⁹

On the other hand, the Framework Convention does not define the subjects in its text.

As such, certain states as Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Switzerland and

³⁶ Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.215.

³⁷ see *ibid.*, footnotes 345 and 346 in the study of the author where she addresses several criticisms to this approach and comments on relevant articles of 2, 3, 8, 12, 13 of the Charter, respectively.

³⁸ see Athanastasia Spiliopoulou-Akermark, Justifications of Minority Protection in International Law (London: Kluwer Law International, 1997), pp.331.

³⁹ see Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.211-212 for the relevant articles of 10, 13 and 15 of the Framework Convention whereby the author criticizes the wording of those articles in terms of their vagueness. To cite a few, these are, “parties concerned”, “as far as possible”, “within the framework of their (the states’) education system”.

Macedonia added their interpretations of the term, which consequently resulted in addition of declarations to the ratification of the Framework Convention and also the Convention stipulates that every signatory report on its implementations every five years.⁴⁰

As Gal argues, the number of laws, decrees or government programs dealing with minority rights stand impressive in Central and Eastern Europe.⁴¹ The reason behind such vigilance might be related with the fact that these states are inclined to integrate with Euro-Atlantic structures, thus they manifest due interest on the issue to prove their capacity of performance. However, it remains to be seen if the Central and Eastern European states shall automatically fulfill their commitments in this regard. Since the implementation of the undertakings is dependent on the political structure of governments and the will of incumbent political units in the states. In this respect, it is known that France and Greece as two full member states of the Union, did not ratify the Framework Convention, an indication of the absence of the will to internalize what is envisaged in these international arrangements.

In general, there exist both positive and negative evaluations regarding the contribution of the Framework Convention on securing the rights of minorities, yet it would be maintained that the Framework Convention is the most impact but detailed European arrangement to date inter alia designated.

⁴⁰ Gal, "The Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and its Impact on Central and Eastern Europe", pp. 2-3.

⁴¹ Ibid.

The Council of Europe continues to be active in the field; in 1997 an Advisory Committee was designated to assist the Council of Ministers monitor agreements, and in 1998, an intergovernmental Committee of Experts was established to deal with minority-related issues (DH.MIN).⁴²

By way of conclusion, in contrast to arguments stating that the Council at best facilitates the work of those states which aim at ameliorating the treatment of minorities⁴³, it may be seen that the Framework Convention represents a step forward in internalizing the European minority policies. Besides, it may be argued that not the document itself, but the negative stances of full members as that of Greece by means of not ratifying the Convention complicates and heralds the achievement of a unified approach in Europe.

1.7 OSCE AND PROTECTION OF MINORITY RIGHTS

The OSCE (Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe) studies on minorities stem from the 1975 Helsinki Final Act and Principle VII of the Declaration on Principles Guiding Relations between Participating States:

The participating states on whose territory national minorities exist will respect the right of persons belonging to such minorities to equality before law, will afford them the full opportunity for the actual enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms and

⁴² Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.214.

⁴³ Daniel T. Froats, "The Emergence and Selective Enforcement of International Minority-Rights Protections After the Cold War", MacArthur Consortium Working Papers in Peace and Cooperation, (December 1996), pp.11, from Columbia International Affairs Online, <http://www.ciaonet.org>.

will, in this manner, protect their legitimate interests in this sphere.⁴⁴

Yet, such a cautious wording covers also those states which maintain that there are no minorities in their territories - particularly Greece and France.⁴⁵ As far as minority related documents are taken into account, from a positive viewpoint, it may be asserted that the Copenhagen Document of the OSCE is an important step towards an adequate international legal system for the protection of minorities. And although the OSCE documents and commitments are not legally binding on OSCE states, they are mere political declarations of intent, they do have a high *de facto* authority. In that, their effective influence as a source of inspiration is evidenced in the UN Declaration on Minorities.⁴⁶

The document sets important trends that contribute to the implementation of an effective minority protection, however, to reiterate as Dalton⁴⁷ stresses, the wording and standards are cautiously flawed throughout the writing process causing vagueness. Thus, the degree to which the states consent to implement the principles and the standards of the OSCE on the related issue depends largely on their commitment and willingness to adjust their domestic law.

To conclude, it may be inferred that being an actual part of Europe both in geographical and legal terms stipulate a certain internalization process. At a time when the formerly communist states of the Central and Eastern Europe are currently

⁴⁴ Richard Dalton, "The Role of the CSCE" in Minority Rights in Europe: The Scope for a Transnational Regime, Hugh Miall ed. (London:Pinter Publishers, 1994), p.99.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Henrard, Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection, pp.206-207, citing A. Bloed, The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe: Analysis and Basic Documents, 1972-1993 (Dordrecht: Kluwer Law International, 1993), pp.93-95.

⁴⁷ Dalton, "The Role of the CSCE", pp.99-111.

implementing the aforementioned regulations so as to become members of the existing

Euro-Atlantic structures and demand being treated as such, the stance of those states - particularly that of Greece - whose inclusion to such structures have already been welcome and deemed as 'inseparable' by Europe, it is noteworthy to analyze why and how the Greek example of unwillingness to adjust the domestic legislation as required by the highlighted regulations, particularly by the Framework Convention. The causal factors and the due effects of this reluctance in the Greek practice shall be examined in the next section to comprehend how a "legally" European state may present itself with standards far from being "European" with respect to minorities.

CHAPTER II

EVOLUTION OF NATIONALISM IN GREECE AND GREEK NATIONAL IDENTITY

*If one exactly defined greek race
existed, how do we explain the diversity
of the Greek peoples?"*

(Jardé, 1996:3)

Just as extensive Greek literature shows, as early as the Classical Period, the Greeks divided the world into two polarities by virtue of being Greek, and being non-Greek, which was commensurate to being “barbarian”.¹ Such exclusionary differentiation which can be labeled as ethnocentrism in due course of time exceeded linguistic distinction and acquired a tone connoting a communal bond among the Greeks. In this straightforward nature of ethnocentrism, it is remarkable that no ancient civilization but Greeks “...invented a term which precisely and exclusively embraced all who did not share their ethnicity”.²

¹ Dirk T.D. Held, “Shaping Eurocentrism: The Uses of Greek Antiquity,” in Greeks and Barbarians, John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz eds. (Bethesda: CDL Press, 1997), pp. 256.

² Held, *ibid.*, quoting Edith Hall, Inventing the Barbarian, Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy (Oxford:1989), pp.4. Held further analyzes the Greek ethnocentrism through comparing it with Eurocentrism and maintains that unlike the former; the latter is complex and historically delimited, yet still the two articulate collective identities. Held (pp. 257-258) holds the view that Eurocentrism distinguishes itself from ethnocentrism through transcending local values.

Coleman argues that “the ancient Greeks were thoroughly ‘ethnocentric’, for they considered their culture superior to that of others and tended to look down upon and despise foreigners”.³ Coleman goes on to maintain that this ethnocentrism had little to do with the foreign elements themselves and much to do with the Greek projections of what they viewed as (un)desirable in their way of living.⁴ The stereotype and the concept “barbarian” created by Greeks, with its entailments of simple-mindedness, coarseness, brutality, slavishness and inferiority shaped Greek attitudes in their actions with foreigners:

Hermippos in his *Lives* ascribes to Thales what others say of Socrates. He used to say, they report, that he thanked Fortune for three things: first I am a human and not a beast; second, that I am a man and not a woman; and third, that I am a Greek and not a barbarian.⁵

Indeed, Greeks are documented as less negative toward foreign peoples in periods preceding the Persian Wars in 5th century BC than they later became. However, Classical Period - late 5th and 4th centuries BC - reflects Greeks being at their most “negative” as a consequence of Persian attack on their territories.⁶

³ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism” in *ibid*, pp. 175. Quotation marks original.

⁴ Coleman, *ibid*. Viewing the issue in modern terms, the author notes that the word itself -barbarian- subsequently came to play a major role in shaping modern European and American prejudices against non-Western peoples.

⁵ Coleman, *ibid.*, quoting Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers, with an English Translation* by R. D. Hicks, 2 Volumes (Cambridge:1950), Loeb Classical Library, pp. 33, vol. 1. Italics original.

⁶ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp.176.

At its outset, Greek life in the Greek peninsula grew on independent city states⁷ numbering in hundreds, sometimes joining in regional leagues, yet it is never reported to have witnessed a single united state.

The land hosted a variety of peoples in it with many features common to all, yet with many differences among them. “Soft Ionians and energetic Spartans, subtle Athenians and thick-skulled Boetians”⁸ were in reality components of Greek peoples yet even after the Macedonian conquest of the southern part of the Greek peninsula for instance in the 4th century BC, these components were almost incessantly fighting each other.⁹ Therefore, Coleman is right when he argues that the Greeks defined themselves as a separate people not because they were affiliated to a single political entity but on the basis of common language, belief, attitude and ancestry.¹⁰ If this is to be coined the idea or the identity of “Greek-ness”, a relevant view by Holden needs to be put forward, whereby he asserts that Greece was more central to “Greek-ness” in the golden age of Classical Greece, 2500 years ago as a collection of quarreling city-states.¹¹

The constituents of the issue of Greekness may well be sought in the material elements that make it up; these elements basically being language, religion, politics and the like when analyzing Greekness and its implications on contact with foreigners.

⁷ The Greek word for the term is “*poleis*” in singular and “*polis*” in plural.

⁸ Auguste François Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, C. K. Ogden ed., M. R. Dobie trans. (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 3-5.

⁹ Jardé, *ibid.*, and Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 172.

Although the primary distinction between the Greeks and the barbarians was based on language, that is, the fact that Greeks spoke Greek, whereas all others did not; it is seen that they also used national names for specific peoples when they wanted: Thracians, Lydians, Persians, Egyptians etc.¹² In further detail, Jardé notes that there were three basic dialects in Greek recognized by the Greeks: Ionic, Aolic and Doric.¹³

It is argued that the word ‘barbaros’¹⁴ was onomatopoeic as noted by the geographer Strabo who lived in the late 1st century BC and early 1st century AD; and it denoted people who spoke unintelligibly that sounded like “bar-bar” to Greek ears.¹⁵ Jardé draws a parallel account with Coleman when asserting that linguistic differences were those which struck the Greeks most and rightly argues that such a puzzled effect would be produced by any foreign language on those who do not know it.¹⁶

Through common languages which varied in dialects, the Greeks grew accustomed to understanding and communicating one another. Yet, it is remarkable that Pamphylian dialect was the only Hellenic tongue which was taken for a barbarian language by the Greeks¹⁷. However, the similarities between the dialects were striking enough for the Greeks to feel that they were speaking the same language

¹⁰ Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp.177

¹¹ David Holden, Greece Without Columns (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1972), pp. 23.

¹² Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 178.

¹³ Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp.60. Jardé elaborates on the subject in the following pages of his book and states that better equipped with comparative grammar, modern philologists have distinguished a fourth group named *Arcado-Cypriot*.

¹⁴ ‘*Barbaros*’ is the Greek word for ‘barbarian’ in English. The plural form is ‘*barbaroi*’.

¹⁵ Coleman (pp. 178) suggests that ‘gibberish people’ would be a reasonable translation for the word.

¹⁶ Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 230. Jardé also makes reference to Strabo as Coleman does and adds that even the “neighing horses, birds singing and bubbling water talk ‘barbarian’; citing Aeschylus, Aristophanes, Sophocles and Eubulos, respectively for each sound.

¹⁷ Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 285.

whereas they never suspected the link between Greek and Indo-European tongues of their neighbors: Thracians, Illyrians or Italians.¹⁸ Overall, linguistic unity stood as the most important component of Hellenic¹⁹ peoples, yet it still was not the only ground on which this common civilization depended; since it was the joint way the Greek people represented themselves in an amalgam of language, religion/belief, land or race which blended the Greek peoples into one Greek people.²⁰ As the Greeks spoke the common language, so they attributed themselves to common beliefs, manners, an average treatment of foreigners, in brief; a shared mindset which has its roots in Classical, Hellenic, Byzantine, Turkokratia periods and finally in the independent Greek state of the date. Pinpointing Greek language as the foremost determinant in Greek national consciousness as such, the remaining sections shall elaborate on other constituents of this “mindset” which functioned as a merger of the Hellenic peoples (= *i Ellines*).

¹⁸ Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 286. See also Holden, Greece Without Columns, pp. 23. Holden adopts a modern angle to the issue and underscores the fact that there still is much division on language, in that the current demotic language is derived from Classical Greek, but has become different from it, while the Greek state imposed an artificial adaptation of classical tongue called “*katharevousa*” (=pure language). See also Andrew Robert Burn, The Pelican History of Greece (London: Penguin Books, 1987), pp. 30-35, where Burn offers a compact overview on peoples and languages and the coming of the Greeks in the peninsula before about 2500 BC. The author also provides detailed accounts of linguistic facts such as adjectival terminations, roots, place names and suggests that the Greek language belongs to the far-flung Indo-European family along with the Celtic, Germanic, Slavonic and Italic (with Romance) language groups, even old Persian and Sanskrit. Burn argues *infra* that this far-flung group of languages whose traces remain in the Aegean and other areas must have been spread by migrations. See also Roger D. Woodard “Linguistic Connections Between Greeks and non-Greeks” in Greeks and Barbarians, John E. Coleman ed., pp. 29-60.

¹⁹ The word is used interchangeably with the word “Greek” *infra* this chapter.

²⁰ In similar vein with Jardé and Coleman, C. M. Woodhouse implicitly views the subject of the history of Greece as a medley of peoples, races, land, language, religion and culture all together, which would be inadequate and unreasonable if asserted in a divided fashion. See C. M. Woodhouse, Modern Greece: A Short Story (London: Faber and Faber, 1991), pp. 11-13; Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 3-6 on a relevant overview; Holden, Greece Without Columns, pp.23; Paul Cartledge, The Greeks (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 1-18 and 35-62. For an instructive account on the linguistic element of this amalgam, see Michael Herzfeld, “National Spirit or the Breath of Nature? The Expropriation of Folk Positivism in the Discourse of Greek

2.1 THE NATURE OF THE CONCEPT “BARBARIAN”: US vs. THEM

As suggested by Cartledge, ‘society’ is a problematic term in the study of antiquity, since in Classical Greece, between about 500 BC and 300 BC, there was not a single united society at all, though the author describes Greeks as having a homogeneous culture, which is too literal to accept.²¹ In Cartledge’s account of views, Aristotle is given as the figure of such an argument and it is stressed that “a northerner by origin, Aristotle was born and brought up in Hellenic heartland where his father was a court physician to a king of not entirely Greek, nor not yet wholly ‘barbarian’ Macedon.”²² Yet Aristotle passed most of his life in Greek south as a resident alien in Athens and what is striking about him was that, at any rate, he thought and felt it was legitimate and correct to talk about “Greeks” and what was “Greek”. Being both an outsider and an insider, what Aristotle took to be common perceptions were the general Greek attitudes and beliefs, the Greek mindset or mentality in his extensive writings.²³

Aristotle might well constitute a renowned example of the common way that Greek minds were organized, yet in general terms, it is acknowledged that scattered all around the Mediterranean basin, the ordinary Greeks recognized themselves as forming a division of the same group, the same family and it can be argued that this feeling was strengthened by the very fact of their dispersion; living in rural communities shut off from one another, which in fact caused the Greeks to preserve their ties and maintain continuous commercial relations with the others due to the

Nationalism,” in *Natural Histories of Discourse*, Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban eds. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 277-298.

²¹ Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 8-9.

²² Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 9.

very weakness of each group; indeed, the Greeks may not have been able to make extensive states, however, at least they preserved the notion of their common origin and the feeling of Hellenic unity.²⁴

This Hellenic unity is best defined by Herodotus when he said “Community of race, community of language, community of manners - that was what in the ancients, guaranteed Hellenic unity.”²⁵

To bring in a geographical grounding to the subject matter, it has been noted that the Greeks expanded their territory as of about 1000 BC, by colonizing the eastern littoral of the Aegean Sea, in other words, the Western Coast of Asia Minor. In the subsequent stages, Greek colonies reached also out to the northern Aegean, the Black Sea, north Africa, Italy²⁶ and the western Mediterranean²⁷.

These colonial settlements may be traced as the means of close contact between the Greeks and the local people including Eteocypriots in Cyprus, Carians, Lydians, and Phrygians in Anatolia; Thracians, Skythians and Taurians in the northern Aegean and the Black Sea; Libyans in Cyrenaica; Illyrians in the Adriatic; Sicels and Punic people in Sicily; Etruscans and Italic peoples in Italy; and lastly Celts and Ligurians

²³ Paul Cartledge, The Greeks, pp. 10-11.

²⁴ Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 229-230. See also Jeremy McInerney, Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis: The Folds of Parnassos (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999), pp. 8-39.

²⁵ Providing both the original Greek and the quoted translation in his work, Jardé, *ibid.*, maintains quite dubious an approach as regards the race-related “community”, yet he assumes the other components correct whilst elaborating the subject *infra* in part 4, chapter 1.

²⁶ Later in history the southern part of Italy colonized by Greeks became known as “*Magna Graecia*”, meaning “Great Greece”.

²⁷ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 179.

in the western Mediterranean.²⁸ The colonies in these regions generally preserved a separate Greek identity; and relations with indigenous peoples varied, in that, in some places, particularly where native rulers wished to enhance their status and prosperity, Greeks may have been welcome as Coleman asserts.²⁹ Nevertheless, to reiterate, it is safe to maintain that Greeks preserved a position of control and authority over the locals which embedded a mentality that these indigenous peoples were inferior.

Such a perception manifests itself in the Greek practice of slavery as the most common means by which they came into close contact with foreigners. As Aristotle and Xenophon mention, hardly any Greek household was without slaves, most of whom were brought from Thrace and Phrygia.³⁰ On the other hand, there were also other foreigners who came to the Aegean as traders, artisans, mercenaries, ambassadors, and consultants to various oracles; Athens hosting many of the foreign merchants and artisans.³¹ Thus it can be inferred that, as a result of the ubiquitous presence of slavery, the foreigners were of such a low status and were portrayed as “barbarian” connoting an inferiority in character and/or in nature.³²

²⁸ Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 179-180. See also Barry Cunliffe, Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction (New York: Methuen, 1988), pp. 12-37.

²⁹ see J. B. Bury and Russel Meiggs, A History of Greece: To the Death of Alexander the Great (London: Macmillan, 1975), pp. 58-63; see also Coleman, *ibid.*

³⁰ There had often been a close connection between Greek wine and foreign slaves as wine was one of the most common of Greek exports and it was much sought after by barbarians. See Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 181, where he cites Cunliffe, Duchene and Finley on the wine affair, wherein wine was alleged to have been traded in return for foreign slaves.

³¹ Athens consisted of “Lydians, Phrygians, Syrians, ‘barbarians’ of all sorts” as Xenophon writes and metics (=resident aliens) along with other foreigners acting as laborers, in commerce and trade; activities all which the Greeks viewed as demeaning, since the dominant values in the Greek society were those of the land aristocracy that gave priority to leisure and a life of the mind.

³² see Martin Bernal, “Race, Class, and Gender in the Formation of the Aryan Model of Greek Origins,” in Nations, Identities, Culture, V. Y. Mudimbe ed. (London: Duke University Press, 1997), pp. 7-28. See also Coleman “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp. 181-185 for further details.

Last but not least, Carras also draws a parallel line in his argumentation on the Greek identity and holds that for most Hellenes, it was life in a polis which gave citizens their sense of identity and privilege in relation to slaves or serfs.³³

By conclusion, it can be argued as Cartledge that etymologically, “the ‘barbarians’ seemed to be those people who ‘babbled’ or ‘stammered’ for the Greeks”, but soon Greeks conceived themselves superior to other peoples as laid out above and came more and more to give the word a pejorative sense which it still possesses today: Because the Greeks were “naturally” free and the barbarians naturally servile, it was right and proper for the Greeks to rule barbarians, if only for their own good. “Greeks (like the Britons of ‘Rule Britannia’) never, never shall be slaves, whereas barbarians were naturally slavish and so tailormade for servitude”, and therefore, fear of enslavement was the main motive for “othering” the barbarian for the majority of ordinary free citizen Greeks.³⁴

2.2 RELIGION UNITY

However far one goes in antiquity, it is argued that one never finds any religious conception framed around monotheism in Greece.³⁵ Moreover, it is asserted that the Greeks had no one word equivalent to the English word “religion”, derived from

³³ Costa Carras, “Identity,” in Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition, available on <http://www.fitzroydearborn.com/encgreece.htm>

³⁴ see Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 40-42.

³⁵ Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People*, pp. 235.

Latin “*ligare*”, “to bind”, owing to the sense of binding felt by human beings in face of supernatural phenomena, nor did they therefore distinguish any words related.³⁶

Owing to a polytheistic approach, the world of Greeks was one full of gods - gods which were bigger, stronger, more beautiful, eternally young, with feelings and passions. Yet what should be stressed is the national character of Greek religion, that is, as reported by Jardé, the citizen was recognized by his compulsory participation in the city worship which was closed to foreigners. Thus it can be deduced that religion and patriotism were linked, or even to take the assertion further; they were the same thing.³⁷

At its outset, each city had its gods and doubtlessly, the city conceived itself under the special protection of one deity to whom it paid due worship; the “*Poliad*” deity, its image symbolizing the city on coins, public seals, decrees and treaties. The feasts of Poliad deity were national festivals once again where the stranger had no place.³⁸

Just as local gods as Athene in Athens, there was a whole group of gods which had become pan-Hellenic such as *Apollo*.³⁹ In a neat illustration on the origins of Greeks’ gods, Herodotus is known to have boldly suggested that the names of almost all gods came to Greece from Egypt, which later found new interpretations as that of Martin Bernal in 1987 that Classical Greek culture as a whole was a direct transplant

³⁶ see Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 152-174, where the author provides a thorough overview of the way the Greeks portrayed gods versus mortals.

³⁷ Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People*, pp. 235-236.

³⁸ Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People*, pp. 236.

³⁹ Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People*, pp. 237.

affected by Egyptian and Phoenician immigrants.⁴⁰ However, interestingly enough, Herodotus was inclined to explain that the Greeks and their culture were mere children by comparison with the Egyptians who had been existing since time immemorial, therefore, in a sense Herodotus wanted to view the issue both ways: the gods both were and were not made in Greece, which gave the message that barbarians were not equally despicable according to him.⁴¹ On the other hand, related with perceiving religion as a cultural self-definition, Cartledge cites the Athenians' reflections in Herodotus' writings on what could be done in order to take revenge from the Persian barbarians and their king Xerxes and on the impediments preventing them from doing so. In doing so, they took into account and saw it necessary to adhere to "the fact of being Greek" which had its own subdivisions: 1) common blood and language, 2) common religious ritual sacrifice (*theon hidrumata koina kai thusiai*), and 3) common way of life and outlook (*ethea homotropa*).⁴² Thus, again, religion is given due emphasis, encompassing an ethnic tone.

It can clearly be seen that community of religion in Greece was one of the strongest bonds which could unite the Greeks. When Aristophanes would preach concord to the Greek peoples, he reminded them that they "besprinkle their altars with the same lustral water, like kinsmen."⁴³ Therefore, as his language and manners, the Greek was distinguished by his religion from the barbarian. To a true-born Athenian, foreign gods looked inconvenient and grotesque by the side of national gods, and one has only to read just how Aristophanes had described the Thracian god Triballo in

⁴⁰ Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 157.

⁴¹ Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 155-156.

⁴² Cartledge, *The Greeks*, pp. 157.

⁴³ Jardé quoting Aristophanes in *Lysistrata*, 1130, in *The Formation of the Greek People* pp. 240.

the Birds: “...that witless puppet, unable to pronounce a single Greek sentence correctly, the most barbarian of all gods.”⁴⁴

2.3 THE PERSIAN WARS

It has been argued that Greeks’ attitudes toward foreigners before and after the Persian Wars of 490 and 480-479 BC reflect notable differences.⁴⁵ As aforementioned, the “barbarian” portrayal was not seen as occasionally as in the preceding years of the Persian Wars, the best known example being the relatively value-free wording in Homer’s *Iliad and Odyssey*, wherein the term “*barbaroi*” is not employed. However, it is also counterargued that Homeric poems consistently represented Greeks as superior to their enemies; to give but one example, the Trojans and their allies have fewer heroes and their social and military organization lack in cohesion in comparison with that of the Greeks in the Homeric poems.⁴⁶ The ideals of Greek society always tended to have a strong military component as war was perceived as the natural result of human acquisitiveness⁴⁷ and none of the people in the colonized lands were able to successfully resist the Greeks by force of arms and all came eventually to be dominated by the Greeks. Gradual elaboration of Greek

⁴⁴ Jardé quoting Aristophanes in *the Birds*, in *The Formation of the Greek People*, 1573, pp. 242.

⁴⁵ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp.186-187.

⁴⁶ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp.187. The author also maintains that the Trojans’ speech was less assertive and warlike. Grounding his argument on the fact that the primarily Homeric virtue is prowess in battle and the fame which results from it and that Trojan war was presented as a total Greek victory, Coleman thinks that ancient listeners and readers of the Homeric poems considered it as telling the glory of Greece and the inferiority of the Trojans and their allies, although not employing the term “*barbaroi*”.

⁴⁷ Coleman, “Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism”, pp.187.

mythic system and cultural manners reinforced Greeks' feelings of superiority in colonized lands.⁴⁸

In general terms, the rise of Lydia in 8th century BC might have been the only reason that affected the way the Greeks viewed foreigners as Coleman argues, since Lydia was the first Asiatic state to cause Greeks to be subjugated. Also, the wealth of Lydian rulers and their promotion of tyrannies in adjacent Greek cities might have encouraged Greek stereotypes of western Asiatics. On the other hand, a factor in Greek attitudes toward foreigners might well have been related to the earlier geographical dichotomy of Europe and Asia as mentioned in the previous chapter. Yet, this is not to say that Greeks had any conceptions of a "European Civilization"; on the contrary "...they regarded all other dwellers in Europe as barbarians and inferior to Greeks."⁴⁹ Therefore it is indeed interesting that later European peoples have come to claim themselves heirs to the glories of Greek culture.

The negative stance in the Greek attitude toward foreigners comes as fostered after the Persian Wars of the first quarter of the 5th century BC, and from then on, particularly the state of Athens employed the term "barbaroi" and its derivatives.⁵⁰ As a consequence the Athenian view of foreigners became predominant throughout much of the Greek world, generally showing itself in the sphere of culture, intellectual achievement, and even climate as Aristotle wrote in *Politics*:

⁴⁸ In a caricatural phrase Coleman (p. 187) even argues that foreigners' initial unfamiliarity with the effects of wine also made them seem weak in Greek eyes.

⁴⁹ Coleman, "Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism", pp. 187.

⁵⁰ see Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 266-289; Coleman, "Ancient Greek Ethnocentrism", pp. 189-194; Burn, The Pelican History of Greece, pp. 167-192; and Cartledge, the Greeks, pp. 158-171.

The Nations that live in cold regions and those of Europe are full of spirit, but somewhat lacking in skill and intellect, for this reason, while remaining relatively free, they lack political cohesion and the ability to rule over their neighbors. On the other hand the Asiatic nations have in their souls both intellect and skill, but are lacking in spirit; so they remain enslaved and subject. The Hellenic race, occupying a mid-point geographically, has a measure of both, being both spirited and intelligent. Hence, it continues to be free, to live under the best *constitutions* and, given a single constitution, to be capable of ruling all other people.⁵¹

Greeks were not enthusiastic about the diversity of peoples as the chief speaker who is an Athenian in Plato's *Laws* sees in horror an intermingling of peoples and says that if Athenians and Lacedaemonians had not joined against Persians they should have by then a mixture of *gene* (races), as Coleman exemplifies: 1) Greek with Greek, 2) Greek with barbarian, and 3) barbarian with Greek.⁵² Lastly, in general terms, although Persians were the strongest opposition and real enemy of Greeks, they are not represented in due frequency in Greek art as opposed to the domain of politics.⁵³

2.4 CITIZEN AND ALIEN

The very fact that the Greeks were conscious of being members of one body translated itself into the perception on Greeks' part to view aliens not only as

⁵¹ Along with this Penguin translated excerpt, Coleman (190-191) cites two longer Hippocrates writings which in an even more interesting wording praise the favorable conditions of climate in Greece which does not exist according to him in Asia and in other parts of Europe. Italics original.

⁵² This is an ultimately tautological view as one cannot even see a slight difference between two and three, and equally unreasonable as even the assumption of a totally homogeneous community is a myth. See *ibid*.

foreigners but also as inferior beings, which Isocrates had interpreted as such: “Between Greek and barbarian, there is no less difference than between man and beast”.⁵⁴ This Greek sentiment was in due course translated into deeds whereby the Greeks invoked unwritten adjustments which were meant for regulating “Greek” life and Greek mankind. The essential function of international law designated by the Greeks was to regulate relations between citizen and alien, between which there was an innate distinction; yet spite of the fact that Greek cities are reported to have occasionally welcomed strangers, since from the very beginning, the stranger was under the protection of gods, and of Zeus in particular; therefore he who turned away the man sent by Zeus incurred the divine Curse.⁵⁵

However, metics⁵⁶ were bound with legal obligations of the city although they were not citizens, in that they, for instance paid the Metic Tax, market dues which other citizens were exempt. Their conditions varying from one poleis to another, the general attitude was more or less the same. In cities where agriculture was the sole or dominant occupation, it was challenging for a foreigner to find a place or to own land.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, even when Greek cities welcomed strangers, they did not go so far as to treat them as citizens since they forbade intermarriage and the regulations recognized as legitimate only those children whose father and mother were

⁵³ It has been suggested by Coleman (p.194), with a few notable exceptions such as the famous painting by Polygnotus of the battle of Marathon in the Painted Stoa at Athens, the Greek artists preferred allegorical allusions when telling Persian Wars.

⁵⁴ Jardé (p. 246) cites Isocrates XV. 293, along with Euripides and Aristotle on the issue and decides that no one ever sought to establish a common denominator between Greeks and “barbarians”.

⁵⁵ see Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 248, where he exemplifies Milesian, Cretan and Athenian practices of friendly treatment of strangers - yet in a limited sense.

⁵⁶ “domiciled foreigners” or “resident aliens”.

⁵⁷ There was a supposedly hostile manner on the part of Spartans for instance; whereas the Athenians are reflected as more friendly to strangers, which in fact sounds quite literal to accept. Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 248.

citizens.⁵⁸ On this intra-city regulations and legal arrangements came other Hellenic practices and traditions which were designed also in the larger spheres of commercial law and laws of war. Reflection on other Hellenic customs once more tells us that a common denominator could not be found as these regulations also were formulae of Greek “superiority”.⁵⁹

Later the Greek cities had been conquered by the Kingdom of Macedon and Greece recognized the hegemony of King Philip. In fact the Greeks began to break loose from their country more and more and from the mixture of all the Hellenic peoples, a cosmopolitan population was being born. With the Macedonian conquest added on, the movement of people and goods became more active. By the contact and the mingling of the Greeks from all parts a common civilization was formed which in fact was not a new thing as Poseidippos observed : “There are many cities but there is only one Greece”⁶⁰ and as a final remark it can be asserted that the Hellenic world was sealed by opposition to the foreigner who was seen as an enemy, yet, the civilization would take in more foreign elements as a result of the then ongoing contacts.

⁵⁸ This was the practiced law both in Athens and in Byzantion as Aristotle’s *Politics* tells.

⁵⁹ For a detailed analysis of commercial law and laws of war, see Jardé, The Formation of the Greek People, pp. 235-265.

2.5 THE ROMAN INFLUENCE

In the period 146 BC-395 AD, Greece lived under Roman rule; however, this did not diminish the sense of a separate Hellenic identity.⁶¹ The Classical revivalists of the 2nd century AD were proud to be culturally Hellenes though content to be part of the Roman Empire; yet from the 3rd century onwards, the growth in religion and the decline of cities led to changes in the description of identity. Therefore; by the 6th and 7th centuries, “Hellenes” had already come to mean “pagans”, an object of scorn for Christians. The loyalty focused on a single state, the Empire of the *Romaioi* (=Romans) and the identity descriptions changed with continued distaste for the barbarians. The barbarians who were effectively occupying the area of Greek cultural and linguistic influence were portrayed more dangerous than ever since they were distinguished less by language and more by their uncultured, destructive, and “barbarous” behavior.⁶²

2.6 THE BYZANTINE PERIOD

Discussion and contention on the Byzantine ethnic infusions which followed the abovementioned Roman influence was first formulated by the German historian Fallmerayer. According to him the ancient Greeks had disappeared completely and

⁶⁰ see Jonathan Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), pp. 143-182; and Jardé, *The Formation of the Greek People*, pp.334-335.

⁶¹ see Carras, Identity, on <http://www.fitzroydearborn.com/engreece.htm>

Greeks were merely descendants of Slavs and Albanians.⁶³ Relevant historical research is known to suggest that Slav tribes settled down in the Greek peninsula as of 6th century which probably led to displacement of many Greeks. It would be too straightforward to assume such an assertion, yet still, it would be reasonable to accept that a certain degree of hellenization and assimilation of Slavs took place during the reign of Justinian II (685-695; 705-711), Constantine VI (780-797) and Irene (797-802) as Vacalopoulos maintains:

The Christianization and hellenization of the Slavs in Macedonia, Thrace and Epirus - at least in those parts of these provinces which remained under Byzantine rule - were pressed on with vigor during the first half of the ninth century, and it is interesting to follow the different stages of the ecclesiastical reorganization of those regions after Christianity had been utterly destroyed there. This meritorious activity of the Byzantine Church reaped its best harvest under Patriarch Photius.⁶⁴

Indeed, the process of Hellenization was not brought about merely by religion, on the contrary, the Slavs were simultaneously exposed to a variety of intellectual, political and economic influences.

On the other hand various approaches are known to have been advanced as to when the Albanians first appeared wherein the most extreme migrations have been traced as early as the 8th century.⁶⁵ Along with the Slavs and Albanians, the diffusion of

⁶² see Burn, The Pelican History of Greece, pp. 369-390; and Carras, Identity, on <http://www.fitzroydearborn.com/engreece.htm>

⁶³ Apostolos E. Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1970), pp. 1-3.

⁶⁴ Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation, pp. 37-38 and 63.

⁶⁵ Gordon, History of Greek Revolution cited by Vacalopoulos (p. 63) along with Friedrich Kruse, Questions on Several Conditions of Modern Greece Important for Antiquity, Answered by a Philhellene (Berlin: 1827); and Bernard Schmidt, The Life of the Modern Greeks and Antiquity, vol. 1, (Leipzig: 1871). Titles translated by Vacalopoulos.

Vlachs and later Turks was observed as components of the peoples on the Greek land and in general terms, the remarkable consensus on the assertion that notable traits of “nimbleness of perception, easy adaptability, depth of feeling, fervent patriotism, hatred of occupation by foreigners and passion for politics” went on to preserve its essence in the Byzantine period.⁶⁶ In the analysis of the Greek civilization during the Roman rule, it is remarkable to see how survival and consolidation of Hellenism was promoted by the Roman rule as Gregorovius underscores:

....The building of Constantinople in itself not only ensured the perpetuation of the Greek nation but the preservation for posterity of the incomparable treasures of Greek civilization. Without Constantinople, indeed, Greece and the Peloponnese would have been conquered and colonized by barbarous peoples. Without this mighty fortified city and the protection which it offered it is impossible to conceive of the conservation of Greek culture, or of the Greek Church, or even of the existence of the Byzantine Empire....⁶⁷

With diverse beliefs, peoples and races, the Roman empire encompassed elements of the ancient cultures of the East, the Hellenistic Empire, and the Roman polity, however as Greek civilization was deeply rooted in the East, it was the Greek speaking element which exerted the most profound and lasting influence upon the Eastern Roman Empire. This profound influence may be coined as taken the form of assimilation of foreign peoples mainly by the spread of Greek learning emanated from the monasteries.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Ferdinand Gregorovius, History of the City of Athens in the Middle Ages from the Time of Justinian to the Turkish Conquest (Stuttgart: 1889), quoted by Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation, pp.17-18.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

The assimilation is known to have extended throughout the entire geographical extent of the Byzantine, in Asia Minor, continental Greece and the islands of the Aegean, and the absorption of the diverse national groups occurred with the dissemination of Greek language and Greek learning. Nevertheless from the 10th to 13th century, various forms of self-expression which were Greek arose within the Byzantine world which led to an effect of growing consciousness of Greek national identity.⁶⁹ This consciousness was coupled by a spirit of popular resistance to the foreign conquerors seen as of the Fourth Crusade (1204), the conquerors being Bulgarian, Serbian, Turkish as well as Latin. It has been correctly posited that this struggle for survival was grounded on a glorified past and, it constituted the principle ingredient of the time.⁷⁰

In line with such a stance, the writings of eminent historians are observed to be replete with the name “Hellene”. To give but one example, Nicetas Choniates prayed God “to keep our people intact” and strove to evoke in Greeks an awareness of the glorious nature of their deeds: “How is it possible for history to recount the great deeds of barbarians when history itself is the greatest achievement of Greeks?”⁷¹ Resistance to conquerors would in due course be heralded with rivalry between two Greek states, Epirus and Nicaea, an accustomed fact as ancient Greek practices might

⁶⁸ Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation , pp. 20. The author exemplifies this practice by mentioning the famous mathematician Leon and his experience in monastery in search of knowledge.

⁶⁹ These feelings of consciousness are reported to have first appeared not in Greece proper but in Asia Minor as manifestations of intellectual heritage, survival of folk songs and ballads, (*paralogai*).

⁷⁰ see Paschalis M. Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoullos, Byzantium and the Great Idea,” in Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity (London: Publications for the Centre for Hellenic Studies, King’s College London, 1998), pp. 25-34; and Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation , pp. 30-31.

⁷¹ see Vacalopoulos, Origins of the Greek Nation , pp. 30.

remind, however, more important was still the mounting resistance movement by the Greeks against the aliens.

The projection of this resistance can be distinguished as the germination of the “*Megali Idea*” symbolized by various figures in Greek history⁷². The idea in question was surrounded by an ambition both to reconquer Constantinople and ancient Greek territories and to reunite all Greeks under one unity, free from foreign domination. The anti-alien sentiment was harnessed in turn by the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 by the Turks and took the shape of a political program based on the replacement of the Ottoman Empire by the Greek state, a restored Byzantine Empire, with the Greek King at his head.⁷³

⁷² Scholars refer to different figures as true originators of the term. Vacalopoulos in Origins of the Greek Nation, pp. 40, believes Theodore II Lascaris, ruler of Nicaea to be the true originator of the “idea” whereas, Kitromilides in “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigopoulou, Byzantium and the Great Idea”, pp. 26 posits the poet Alexander Soutsos as the original employer of the term quoting from Political Drama (*O Prothypourgos kai o atithasos politis*) (Brussels: 1843), pp. 9-10: “And if there were to come to the Race some *great idea*

of setting its lifeless limbs in motion
and if it sought its ancestral heritage,
the empire of its Comnene great-grandfathers,
what rash spirit would show resistance to this
and smother this voice of all,
the people within and without [Greece’s borders]?”

(italics added, parentheses original).

See also Steven W. Sowards, “Greek Nationalism, the ‘Megali Idea’ and Venizelism to 1923,” available on <http://www.lib.msu.edu/sowards/balkan/lect14.htm>; Paschalis Kitromilides, “Greece & Cyprus: The Foundations of Nationalism,” available on www.cyprus-conflict.net/Kitromilides.htm; David C. Pugh, “The Seven Rules of Nationalism,” available on <http://www.riga.lv/minelres/archive.htm>; all seven points apply to *Megali Idea* in their essence though not gathered as components of the idea itself. See also A. Triandafyllidou et al., “New Greek Nationalism,” in Sociological Research Online, vol.2 (1), available on <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline /2/1/7.html>, especially point 4.5. See also Gail Holst-Warhaft “Great Expectations: The Burden of Philhellenism and Myths of Greek Nationalism,” in Greeks and Barbarians, John E. Coleman and Clark A. Walz eds., pp.280-281. See also Richard Clogg, A Concise History of Greece (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 47-99; K. E. Fleming, “Athens, Constantinople, ‘Istanbul’: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity,” in New Perspectives on Turkey, (22), pp.1-2; and Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity,” in Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans, vol.1 (1) (Spring 2000), pp.7-14.

⁷³ see Gail Holst-Warhaft, “Great Expectations: The Burden of Philhellenism and Myths of Greeks Nationalism”, pp. 281.

Thus, Greek national identity acquired a status which opposed them not only to the antagonistic national entities in the Balkans and within Greece, but also to the Ottoman “barbarians” in the future.⁷⁴ It has been argued that one strong strand of Early Modern Orthodox apocalypticism viewed the fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans as being the direct result of divine intervention: “It was the will of God for the City to fall to the Turks (= *Itan thelima Theou i Poli na Tourkepsi*).⁷⁵ In other words, the Ottoman conquest in fact was the punishment for Greeks, more neatly, for their lapses from the true Orthodox faith and; the Greeks thought that “the City” would be restored to them if they purified themselves and restored good faith. However “*Megali Idea* was to remain just that - an idea”, which would ultimately result in territorial losses, rather than gains for the Greeks.⁷⁶

2.7 GREEK IDENTITY UNDER OTTOMAN RULE

Greek speaking populations lived under the Ottoman rule for almost four centuries (1453-1830) and they were only one among many people composing the multiethnic mosaic of the Sublime Porte: “Ethnic Greeks, Slavs, Bulgarians, Armenians, Albanians, Jews and Levantines lived in a world in which the notion of nationalism, national identity and their exclusive narratives were virtually absent.”⁷⁷ In a similar

⁷⁴ see Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity”, pp.9

⁷⁵ K. E. Fleming quoting N. G. Politis, *Selected Greek Folksongs* (Athens: Vagionaki, 1978), pp. 13 in “Athens, Constantinople, ‘Istambol’: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity”, pp. 2.

⁷⁶ K. E. Fleming , “Athens, Constantinople, ‘Istambol’: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity”, pp. 2.

⁷⁷ Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity”, pp.9.

fashion, the Greek Orthodox Church which had privileges under the Millet system was not eager at all to promote any national particularism, yet its “ubiquitous ecclesiastical apparatus had provided the only visible factor of a certain common identity and differentiation *vis-à-vis* the dominating Muslims.”⁷⁸

Ethnic Greeks, compared to other groups were privileged in an important respect, as following the Byzantine practices, they carried out their ecclesiastical affairs in Greek. Moreover, adding to language which was a factor in preserving a national identity; in the 1821 War of Independence, Albanians, Vlachs and Slavs fought side by side with Greeks against the Ottoman rule. However, relevant literature does not attribute the movement to the Greeks and neighboring peoples of the Greek territories, but to the Great Powers (Britain, Russia, France) who acted as the brokers of Greece’s independence and its political life throughout the 19th century.⁷⁹

⁷⁸ Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity”, pp.9. See also Molly Mackenzie, Turkish Athens: The Forgotten Centuries, 1456-1832 (Berkshire: Ithaca Press, 1992). Mackenzie adopts totally opposite an approach and asserts that Athens sank into a state of decay and misery and corruption due to selfish, arrogant and inefficient Ottoman rulers. Moreover, contrary to the cited argument, she maintains that a Greek national consciousness was always existing, resentful of the Ottoman rule. In parallel terms, K. E. Fleming, in “Athens, Constantinople, ‘Istanbul’: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity”, pp. 14 , argues that during the Turkish rule (= *Turkokratia*), Greek identity was articulated first through the vocabulary of struggle against the Ottoman reign and secondarily, through that of opposition to Catholic and Protestant West. For the mosaic of the national identities mentioned and languages in Salonica after Ottoman rule for instance, see Salonique, 1850-1918: La “Ville des Juifs” et le Réveil des Balkans, Gilles Veinstein ed. (Paris: Editions Autrement, 1993), chap. 2, passim.

⁷⁹ K. E. Fleming, in “Athens, Constantinople, ‘Istanbul’: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity”, pp. 7. See also The Foundation of the Modern Greek State: Major Treaties and Conventions (1830-1947), Photini Constantopoulou ed. (Athens: Kastanistis Editions S. A., 1999), pp. 27-57, for the treaties signed by Greece with the Great Powers mentioned in the scene throughout the 19th century. The texts are offered in their original language, either French or English. See also the introduction section (pp. 13-24) in *ibid*.

The recognition of Greek independence in 1830 was the result of the first attempted European intervention in favor of a national liberation movement which had come to being due to the universal significance of the Classic Hellenic past “which had captured the romantic imagination of Enlightenment intellectuals...” and; in similar fashion, it may well be noted that there grew an over-appreciation of an eternal Greece evolved by European intellect who came to see Greece as the cradle of civilization, democracy, philosophy, art, drama, etc.⁸⁰

Hence, already glorified by Renaissance, Greece was idealized by Europe as an unprecedented success. In other words, it was not the Greeks, but the Europeans who tended to take the origins of civilization to Hellas; which actually had a flattering effect on the part of Greeks. These imported ideas and feelings were in turn coupled with a similarly imported notion of the universal significance of their nation. Thus, new Hellenism was offered a universally accepted status based on what Finlay called “Homer, Plato & Co.”, which later opposed them not only to the Ottoman “barbarians”, but also to all other national identities that would come to emerge in the Balkans and in Greece proper.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity”, pp. 7. For a compact account of the Greek revolution in the 1820s, see Charles and Barbara Jelavich, The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920 (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1977), chap. 3, passim.

⁸¹ Constantine Tsoukalas, “European Modernity and Greek National Identity”, pp. 9-10; and C. M. Woodhouse, Modern Greece, pp.12 where he cites George Finlay, one of the widely known philhellenes in the related literature. In a similar strand of thought, Tsoukalas (p. 13) mentions philhellene poets such as Cavaphy, Elytis and also the Greek Nobel prize winner George Seferis; and briefly argues that such figures were also effective in the universal articulation of the Hellenic glory in their eloquence.

In final remarks, it can be posited that the neither-nor⁸² portrayal of Greece's "unique" self-definition (neither western nor eastern, neither Catholic nor Protestant, neither wholly pagan antiquity's descendants nor orientals) still exists, yet it is a fact that Europe has already welcome this Greek component into its visible unity, namely the European Union, although Greece displays an in-between image and has not clarified its identity. These oppositions do not seem to have vanished from Greek practices in the treatment of foreign elements and they indeed served for the continuity and even for the worsening of the unfavorable situations of the foreign elements in Greece to date. It seems that either this positive European intervention was not projected on Greece in terms of minority policies or; though projected, Greece did not display inclined behavior as to adopt what was reflected upon it. The following sections elaborate on how and why this discordant image of Greece has come to evolve, exemplifying the situations of Turks, Macedonians, Albanians, Vlachs, Pomaks, the Roma and, the Jews in Greece grounding the issue on both the legal framework laid out in the previous chapter and the historical account collected in this section.

⁸² K. E. Fleming, in "Athens, Constantinople, 'Istanbul': Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth-Century Greek National Identity", pp. 19. See also Keith R. Legg and John M. Roberts, Modern Greece: A Civilization on the Periphery (London: Westview Press, 1997), chap. 1, passim, for modern Greek views on the issue; see James Pettifer, The Greeks (London: Viking, 1993), introduction; and George A. Kourvetaris, Studies on Modern Greek Society and Politics (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 1-26. Another identity and nationhood analysis is also available in Yorgos A. Kourvetaris and Betty A. Dobratz, A Profile of Modern Greece: In Search of Identity (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), chap. 1, passim. See also Demetrios J. Constantelos, The Greeks: Their Heritage and Its Value Today (Massachusetts: Hellenic College Press, 1996).

CHAPTER III

POLICIES AND PRACTICES OF GREECE WITH RESPECT TO ITS MINORITIES

3. 1 OVERVIEW OF THE SITUATION

As posited in the previous sections in length, incorporation of the minority groups into the structures constituting state and civil life in Greece manifest quite non-integral a portrait due to the innate dichotomy between “us” and “them”. As Triandafyllidou *et al.*¹ state, this perception is exemplified by a neologism coined by Sartzetakis, the former President of Greece, in a speech delivered in Greece in 1989; the Greeks define themselves as “anadelphon”, which essentially denotes “a nation deprived of brothers or allies”.

In line with the sense of the word, Triandafyllidou *et al.* further maintain that this principle sets the foundations of the distinctiveness of Greekness; in view of such a mindset, the “others” were supposed to be outside the internal structures or borders, which incrementally gave way to a tendency to see the minorities through a negligent

¹ A. Triandafyllidou *et al.*, “New Greek Nationalism,” in Sociological Research Online, vol. 2, no. 1, 1997, available on <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/1/7.html>

and unfavorable perspective at best; and through exclusionary practices, assimilation and expulsion at worst²; thus reflecting adherence to the idealized “we”, i. e., “the nation”.³ As Milo correctly notes, the principles concerning the protection and the rights of minorities have been integrated into the constitutions of Balkan countries, yet this integration excludes that of Greece.⁴ Citing the renowned expert on the related literature Adamantia Pollis, Milo writes that there is discrepancy between the official stance towards the existence of minorities and the self identity of the people involved.⁵ According to Article 3 of the Greek Constitution, the Orthodox religion is the official religion of Greece, which renders the Greek Orthodox Church superior, in parallel terms adding on to the isolation of minorities of different religions, restriction of minority rights⁶ and related reluctance of recognizing minorities which shall be elaborated in the present section.

Nevertheless, it might be worthwhile and equally interesting to cite the law draft proposed in 9 February 2001 by Evangelos Venizelos, Greek Minister of Culture, which was prepared to declare September 15 as the official day for commemorating

² Ibid.

³ Ibid. Triandafyllidou *et al.* incorporate the Greek case with the larger issue of Balkan nationalisms wherein the nation is generally defined in ethnic terms and as a compact unit through the analysis of the Greek - Macedonian relations. See also Pascalis Kitromilides, “ ‘Balkan Mentality’: History, Legend, Imagination,” in Nations and Nationalism, vol. 2, no. 2, July 1996, pp. 163-191; and Panayote Elias Dimitras, “Writing and Rewriting History in the Context of Balkan Nationalisms,” in Southeast European Politics, vol. 1, no. 1, October 2000, pp. 41-59, where the author provides analysis of Greek nationalism among other nationalisms with surveys conducted on neighboring Balkan peoples in different countries. See Steven D. Nelson, “Comparing Aromanian, Bosniak, Macedonian and Roma - Late or Failed - Nation-Building in the Balkans,” AIM Athens, 14 April 2001, available on <http://www.aimpress.org/dyn/trae/archive/data/200104/10414-002-trae-ath.htm>.

⁴ Paskal Milo, “Constitutional Rights and Minorities in the Balkans: A Comparative Analysis,” in Perceptions, vol. 2, no. 3, September - November 1997, available on <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupa/percept/113/113-2.html>.

⁵ Ibid. Milo quotes Adamantia Pollis, “Greek National Identity: Religious Minorities, Rights and Norms,” in Journal of Modern Greek Studies, vol. 10, no. 2, October 1992, pp. 188.

⁶ Ibid.

“the Genocide of the Greeks in Asia Minor by the Turks in 1922,”⁷ an attempt very much like that debated in the French Parliament on the Armenian issue, yet; one which Greece could not afford to accept, most probably due to revisiting any possible costs of the action and the country’s own relevant record. Inclination to preserve the profile it assumes to be posing in the EU and/or the Balkans might have been the determinant in reverting from the issue for Greece, however; as following sections articulate, not the issue of people “without”, but that of “within”, in Greece’s contemporary politics, i. e., the minorities, requires to be drawn attention to, rather than harnessing the dormant and ever-present feelings of hypernationalism.

3. 2 FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES AND GREECE

Greece signed the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities in Strasbourg on 22 September 1997, yet it has not ratified it.⁸ As per Article 28.1 of the Greek Constitution, ratified international instruments take precedence over Greek Domestic Law:

The generally recognized rules of international law, as well as international conventions as of the time they are sanctioned by statute and become operative according to their respective condition, shall be an integral part of domestic Greek law and shall prevail over any contrary provision of the law.⁹

⁷ “Greek Nationalism Proposal Fuels Balkan Nationalism,” Open Letter by Giorgios Nakratzas to Evangelos Venizelos, Greek Minister of Culture, available on http://www.florina.org/html/2001/2001_fueling_nationalism_html#

⁸ Martin Alexanderson, “Why the Framework Convention Should be Ratified,” in *Mare Balticum*, vol. 3, August 1997, pp. 21-22, available on www.riga.lv/minelres/publicat/Alexan_1.htm.

⁹ Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) and Minority Rights Group - Greece (MRG-G), “Report About Compliance With the Principles of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,” available on www.greekhelsinki.gr/Minorities-of-Greece.html.

However, just as the case, if international instruments are not ratified, the sole provision in the Greek Constitution that operates concerning the rights of minorities is Article 5.2:

All persons living within the Greek territory shall enjoy full protection of their life, honor and liberty irrespective of nationality, race or language and of religious or political beliefs. Exceptions shall be permitted only in cases provided by International Law.¹⁰

Though the Greek Constitution does in no form or shape define “minority”, it acknowledges the existence of only one among all, in religious character, which are the Muslims of Thrace whose rights have been guaranteed the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. However, Greek laws use the terms “*omogenis*” and “*allogenis*” when differentiating between ethnicity.¹¹ It has been noted in the 1999 Report of Greek Helsinki Monitor and Minority Rights Group - Greece that such “*allogenis*” Greek citizens have been stripped of their citizenship if they settled abroad for future with respect to Article 19 of the Greek Citizenship Code, which eventually came to be abolished in 1998:

A person of non-Greek origin leaving Greece without the intention of returning may be declared as having lost Greek nationality. This also applies to a person of non-Greek ethnic origin born and domiciled abroad. His minor children living abroad may be declared as having lost Greek nationality if both their parents or the surviving parent have lost the same. The Minister of the Interior decides in these matters with the concurring opinion of the National Council.¹²

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ The terms refer to “national and ethnic Greeks”, and “non-ethnic Greeks”, respectively. See *ibid.*, Article 3.

¹² see Lois Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Turks of Greece, A Helsinki Watch Report (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1990), pp. 11.

The same report writes that while the bulk of 60,000¹³ people who lost their citizenship under Article 19 between 1955 and 1998; *omogenis* people of Greek origin who were citizens of other countries could swiftly acquire Greek citizenship.

These constitute but two examples of the Greek official attitudes and practices among many observed to date¹⁴. Yet, official voices of pro-integration in the Greek Parliament are also known to have raised questions regarding the ratification of the Convention on minority issues. In 1999 when MP Maria Damanaki of the Progressive Left Coalition requested that the Parliament discusses and ratifies the Convention, the Minister of Foreign Affairs in his written answer declared that “The ratification of the Framework Convention of Council of Europe is a matter of time”¹⁵. However, the ratification of the Convention still remains to be seen while many reports make reference to the necessity of the implementation of the related international instruments by Greece.¹⁶

¹³ Figure provided by the then Minister of Interior Alekos Papadopoulos, “*Avghi*”, 24 January 1998.

¹⁴ see the “Report About Compliance With the Principles of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities,” wherein the Greek Helsinki Monitor and Minority Rights Group - Greece provide a neat observation. The report comprises of the first 18 Articles of the Convention and Greece’s relevant practices and examples. See Appendix A.

¹⁵ “Parliamentary Question To the Minister of Foreign Affairs”, 18 October 1999, available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/pressrelease/daman-18-10-1999.html>.

¹⁶ see “United States of America, Congressional Record, Proceedings And Debates of the 107th Congress”, First Session, vol. 147, no. 0, Washington, 21 March 2001, “Celebrating Greek Independence Day,” available on <http://www.csce.gov/crs>; United Nations, General Assembly, Report A/51/542/Add.1, 7 November 1996, available on <http://www.unhcr.ch/>; United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Report E/CN.4/1998/6, 22 January 1998, available on <http://www.unhcr.ch/>; “Press Release by the Political Secretariat of Rainbow”, Florina-Lerin, 11 October 1999, available on <http://www.florina.org>. Also see “Press Release by 3 Minority Deputies and 28 Minority organizations and NGOs on the Occasion of the Universal Day Against Racism (21 March)”, 19 March 1999, available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/pressrelease.htm>; “Human Rights Watch World Report 2002: Greece”, available on <http://www.turkses.com/>. For a more comprehensive report, see “European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance: Second Report on Greece”, available on <http://www.turkses.com/>; see also “Statement to the 2001 OSCE Implementation Meeting Working Session on ‘Rule of Law, 18 September 2001, Greece: Unfair Treatment of Migrants and Minorities” available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>; and “U.S Department of State, Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2000: Greece”, available on www.state.gov.

3.3 TURKS IN GREECE

The settlement and subsequent presence of the Turks in Western Thrace is reflected as dating back to the 2nd century B.C.¹⁷; while some related accounts note the first Turkish traces in the region as 12th century¹⁸. In line with the latter, which is more sound, Oran in his comprehensive writings marks the history of the Turks of Western Thrace as beginning with the Ottoman conquest of the region in the 12th century; more neatly illustrated as the 1363 conquest of Eastern Thrace and the subsequent 1364 conquest of Western Thrace.¹⁹

In geographic terms, Western Thrace is a narrow portion of land of 8,578 square kilometers, stretching horizontally across the northern coasts of the Aegean, surrounded by Bulgaria, Turkey and the Aegean Sea. Statistics reflect the overall population of Turks in the region in 1922-23 as 129,120; yet the current figure is 110,000²⁰. 80 % of the minority is traced to be localized in rural areas displaying a high birth rate of 3%, which on the other hand was not reflected as an increase in the number of population due to emigration to Turkey amounting to 250,000.²¹ Nevertheless, the figure for those Western Thrace Turks residing in Turkey

¹⁷ see File on the Problems of Turkey - The Western Thrace Turks Issue in Turkish - Greek Relations (Ýstanbul: International Affairs Agency, 1992), pp. 9 and 11; and Murat Hatipođlu, Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar ve Azýnlýklar (Ethnic Groups and Minorities In Greece), (Ankara: Stratejik Arařtırma ve Etüdler Milli Komitesi, 1999), pp. 22.

¹⁸ see Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 1

¹⁹ Baskýn Oran, Türk -Yunan Ýlipkilerinde Batý Trakya Sorunu (Western Thrace Question in Turkish-Greek Relations), (Ankara: Mülkiyeliler Birliđi, 1986), pp. 8.

²⁰ Turkish Minority in Greece - Greek Minority in Turkey, pp. 9. (Author's name, date and place of publication not printed, accessible in the library of Turkish Grand National Assembly). For an extensive account on Turkish existence in the Balkans and in Thrace, see Edward Stanford, Carte Ethnologique de la Turquie D'Europe et de la Grece et Mémoire sur la Répartition Actuelle des Races Dans la Péninsule Illyrique Aves Tableaux Statistiques, E. Dentu ed. (Paris: Palais-Royal, 1877).

²¹ Baskýn Oran, "Batý Trakya'daki Müslüman Türk Azýnlýđý," in Türk-Yunan Uyuřmazlýđý, Semih Vaner ed. (Ýstanbul: Metis, 1990), pp. 152.

announced by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Turkey is 2874 as January 2002²²; consisting of those “*heimatlos*”²³ or “*iskat*”²⁴.

In general terms, the Turks of Western Thrace criticize and accuse the Greek state on the grounds that it follows a discriminative policy denying the rights granted by multilateral and bilateral agreements; and those granted by Greek citizenship.²⁵ The reaction by the Greek state against these allegations has been observed as objection to the accusations, stressing that the Greek laws have not been and are not exercised in discriminative manner; on the other hand, as the regards the accusations which suggest that international agreements are not exercised, the Greek official stance is known to have manifest a tendency to substantiate the issue on a counter-argument as an answer: the argument that the Greek Orthodox population in Ýstanbul decreased from 90,000 to 5,000; and that the Turkish government was responsible for this²⁶.

Through legal instruments and arrangements, it is seen that the first international agreement on minority protection in Greece was the 1830 London Protocol which declared Greece independent, with Great Britain, France and Russia acting as the brokers of Greek political and international affairs. It guarantees the protection of the Muslims in the territories of Greece.²⁷ The second international agreement similar to the London Protocol is the 1881 Ýstanbul Convention signed on the one hand by

²² Yeni Đafak, 7 January 2002.

²³ “stateless”.

²⁴ “deprived of Greek citizenship”.

²⁵ Oran, “Batý Trakya’daki Müslüman Türk Azýnlýđý,” pp. 52.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Baskýn Oran, “Türk Dýp Politikasý ve Batý Trakya,” in Türk Dýp Politikasýnýn Analizi, Faruk Sönmezođlu ed. (Ýstanbul: Der Publications, 1998), pp. 311.

France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Britain, Italy, Russia; and on the other hand by the Ottoman Empire, again guaranteeing the rights of Muslim minorities in the territories given to Greece.²⁸ The third is known as the 1913 Athens Agreement which was signed between Ottoman State and Greece and; the fourth is the Greek Sevres signed on 10 August 1920.²⁹ This last agreement is larger in scope in that it undertakes to protect the rights of not only the Muslims but also all other minorities. The fifth and the last international agreement is the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne, specifically Article 45 and preceding Articles of 37 - 44 that it makes reference to.³⁰ As Oran argues³¹, also the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, signed concurrently in Lausanne, the 1926 Athens Agreement, 1930 and 1933 Ankara Agreements relate to the rights of the Turkish minority in Western Thrace.³²

Poulton argues³³ that given the cited legal arrangements, Turkey has seen itself as having the right to a say over the issues relating to the Turkish community more, for example, than the case in Bulgaria where a solid amount of Turkish population also exists, yet; where no such specific treaties do; and but less than the case in Cyprus

²⁸ Oran, "Türk Dýþ Politikasý ve Batý Trakya," pp. 312.

²⁹ Ibid. See also idem, Türk-Yunan Ýliþkileri'nde Batý Trakya Sorunu, pp. 43. See idem, "Batý Trakya'daki Müslüman Türk Azýnlýðý," pp. 155. Oran stresses that three different Sevres treaties were concluded on 10 August 1920 in the French city of Sevres: 1) The Sevres Agreement which divided the Ottoman Empire; referred to as the "Ottoman Sevres" by the author, 2) The Sevres Agreement which gave Western Thrace to Greece, referred to as "Thracian Sevres" by Oran and; 3) the third Sevres agreement named by Oran "Greek Sevres", signed by Greece and the Allies, guaranteeing the protection of minorities in Greece. Oran refers to British Foreign and State Papers, vol. 113, no. 471, for the full text of the "Greek Sevres".

³⁰ Oran, "Türk Dýþ Politikasý ve Batý Trakya," pp. 312. See Appendix B.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Ibid. For full text of these conventions and agreements, see Stephen Ladas, The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932), part II passim, and appendices therein. Texts in French.

³³ Hugh Poulton, "Ethnic Turks and Muslims in the Balkans and Cyprus," in Mediterranean Politics, Richard Gillespie ed. (London: Pinter, 1996), pp. 110-112.

for instance, where Turkey displays more power as one of the guarantor states. Poulton further notes³⁴ that the consistent feature of the way the Greek government handles issues pertaining to Western Thrace since 1960s has been reciprocation, one which implies tit-for-tat arguments as aforementioned.³⁵

Viewed in retrospect, the history of Western Thrace Turks reflects attempts of independence movements, the first of which took place after the 1878 San Stefano Agreement. This agreement gave Western Thrace to Bulgaria, causing the Turks in the region to revolt which resulted in the establishment of an interim government named “Rhodope Government”³⁶. Yet, owing to the revision of the agreement in the Congress of Berlin, this government was annulled after eight years in 20 April 1886. The second attempt is seen during the 1913 Balkan War when Enver Bey ordered Commander Kuşçubaşı Eşref and his 116 soldiers to reach the region where they had been notified the Turks were being annihilated by Bulgarian gangs. The Turkish battalion quelled the riot and “Western Thrace Government” was set up on 31 August 1913 which would last only fifty-eight days.³⁷ The third Western Thrace Turkish Administration was set up by Fuat (Balkan) on 30 July 1915, which held power until 27 September 1917. This government also proved to be short-lived due to the negative international and regional conjuncture of the time.³⁸ The fourth and the longest attempt of independence movement was the “Western Thrace National

³⁴ Poulton, “Ethnic Turks and Muslims in the Balkans and Cyprus,” pp. 112.

³⁵ Hakkı Akalın, *Turkey and Greece: On the Way to Another War?* (Ankara: Net, 1999), pp. 162.

³⁶ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan’da Etnik Gruplar*, pp 23; and Oran, *Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batı Trakya Sorunu*, pp. 9.

³⁷ Ibid. See also Ahmet Kayıhan, *Lozan ve Batı Trakya* (İstanbul: Türkiye Basımevi, 1967), pp. 6-12. The members of this government were Hüseyin Paşa, Mehmet Paşazade, Pükrü Bey, Hacı Saffet Bey of Alexandroupolis, Hafız Galip Efendi of Komotini, Hacı Ysa Efendi of Xanthi, head of government Dersiam Salih Efendi, Major Süleyman Askeri Bey of Alexandroupolis; and Hilmi Paşa of Xanthi. Ibid., pp. 7.

Government”³⁹ which annulled itself as a consequence of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne.⁴⁰ The last phase in this chain of attempts is the ideological struggle which soon turned to be disapproved by the Turkish community, as it was aimed at starting a new independence movement, however this time under Stalinist principles. The Turkish community came to realize that this was not a national struggle and it did not take long before it dissolved in its time.⁴¹

Through these phases, Turkish community came to be labeled as a Muslim minority by Greece, which in due course manifest uneasiness in several aspects of life. To start with, as regards Article 19, Turks are known to have lost citizenship, the mostly heard of examples being students who went abroad to study in Turkey or Germany and found that they had lost citizenship when they tried to return to Greece and were not permitted to come back.⁴² Before the law was abrogated in 1998, it was acknowledged by lawyers representing the Turkish minority that if an ethnic Turk was out of the country, the police would ask his/her neighbors if s/he would return to Greece. If they received “no” as an answer, the police would send a notice to the Ministry of the Interior to deal with the matter, which mostly was followed by a decision of stripping citizenship. The decision would be printed in the official gazette, yet the person would not be notified thereof.⁴³ Among all, it is notable that Semahat Haliloglou and Arap Haliloglou lost their citizenship when they were doing

³⁸ Celalettin Yücel, *Dýþ Türkler* (Ýstanbul: Hun, 1976), pp. 133.

³⁹ “Batý Trakya Devlet-i Muvakkatesi” or “Batý Trakya Ulusal Hükümeti”.

⁴⁰ Kayýhan, *Lozan ve Batý Trakya*, pp. 11

⁴¹ see *ibid.*, pp. 10-11, where the author gives details on the issue on how this struggle was initiated in 1946 by “Comrade Ekrem”, son a Circassian Bey of Adapazarý and a graduate of Mitilini Greek High School, when he fled the Alexandroupolis Prison to join communist gerilla warfare in Greece, and how he could not manage to get the support of Turkish community.

⁴² Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 12.

⁴³ see *ibid.*, pp. 12-13 for several citizenship stripping cases.

their military service in the Greek Army.⁴⁴ It has also been reported that despite encouraging Turks to go to different regions in Greece to find jobs, the Greek authorities later stipulated that the Turks stayed where they settled; and threatened them on the grounds that they would be expelled from their jobs unless they took Greek names.⁴⁵

Secondly, education stands as another field in which certain friction has been traced particularly since 1950s. As per a culture agreement concluded on the basis of reciprocity (1951), Turkey sends teachers to Greece and young people of Western Thrace come to Turkey to take teachers' training with the aim of going back to Western Thrace and to teach there.⁴⁶ In the 1950s, the Greek authorities referred to the Turkish primary schools as "Turkish" by name, as per law 3065/1954 which the Turks called "Marshall Papagos Law", yet in the late 1950s, the official Greek changed and Greece chose to use the term "Muslim" for schools, peoples, etc...⁴⁷

When the Junta administration took power in 1967, the education of the Turkish minority embarked in its most uneasy phase whereby the Greek government began to appoint the administrative boards of Turkish schools, which until then were chosen by Turkish parents. Transfer of schoolbooks from Turkey was stopped by 1951 and the use of Turkish names were banned.⁴⁸ Ethnic Turkish children have been reported to be taught with out-dated Turkish schoolbooks and it is also acknowledged that Turkish language teachers are trained in a special academy in Thessaloniki; they do

⁴⁴ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 35 and Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 12.

⁴⁵ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 35; and Oran, *Türk -Yunan Yıllıklarında Batı Trakya Sorunu*, pp. 111-113.

⁴⁶ Oran, "Batı Trakya'daki Müslüman Türk Azınlığı," pp. 158-159.

not speak Turkish well due to a backward curriculum they receive, with little contact with developments in Turkey.⁴⁹ A Greek law dated May 1984 that stipulated that the entrance examinations to the two secondary Turkish minority schools in Komotini and Xanthi, as well as graduation examinations had to be in Greek led to a remarkable decline in the number of pupils - from 227 in Xanthi and 305 in Komotini in 1983-84, to 85 and 42 respectively in 1986-87.⁵⁰ As reported by Helsinki Watch, according to the former Turkish Consul to Komotini, Mr. Önder Alpmen, fewer than 10 % of the students who graduate from Turkish elementary schools⁵¹ continue to attend Greek secondary schools, 70 % of whom are said to come to Turkey to attend secondary school.

As regards the out-dated content of the books, the Greek government sources, as reported in *Dateline*, 19 May 1990, claim that the schoolbook issue was the fault of Turkey and not Greece. The former Greek Prime Minister Constantine Mitsotakis is known to have stated that schoolbooks were supposed to be specifically adapted for use by Greek nationals who are members of Muslims minority, under the terms of the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. Mitsotakis claimed that he had requested changes to be made by the Turkish educational authorities which he claimed were never done. In line with this, Greek authorities objected to those schoolbooks as, they said, these were intended to educate citizens of Turkey.⁵²

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Poulton, "Ethnic and Muslims in the Balkans and Cyprus," pp. 112.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 40. According to the then Greek Information Office Director Papaconstantinou, there existed 300 primary schools, 2 Muslim religious schools, two secular high schools, and four gymnasia serving the "Muslim" minority in Western Thrace.

⁵² Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 42. See also "İsmarlama Kitaba Protesto," in *Batı Trakya'nın Sesi*, vol. 40, March, 1992, pp.4.

The Greek government was also reported to inhibit Turks' freedom of movement through passport seizures, which by the Turkish community was said to be "many" in 1989. In some cases, people returning to Greece were told that their passports were no longer valid, while in some police came to people's homes and demanded passports. In most cases the passports were returned after two to eight months, yet with no explanation. The number of such people amounted to 40-50 in 1989.⁵³

Regarding the denial of ethnic identity, it is notable that the Greek policy changed over the years⁵⁴ whereby for instance; 1) a geography book of 1933 written in Turkey was described as "a Turkish book" by Greece, 2) a Turkish school in Komotini about forty years ago, in which a sign identified the school as "Turkish elementary school", on which the name was written in Turkish and Greek, 3) protocols of curricula in Turkish elementary schools for the educational year 1957-58; wherein the schools were referred to as "Turkish schools", 4) an elementary school diploma dated 10 June 1957, written in Greek and Turkish, in which 13-year-old Hatice Ýmam was identified as a "Turk" and; 5) two emergency orders dated 1954 and 1955 in which the chief administrator of Thrace ordered relevant municipalities to change all signs from "Muslim minority" to "Turkish minority".⁵⁵

⁵³ Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 13. Among many, lawyer Adem Bekiroglou's passport was seized for three months in 1989 as he was on his way to Turkey. When Bekiroglou asked the officer why his passport had been confiscated, he replied: "I don't know the reason. I have my orders." After forwarding the action to the Court, Bekiroglou received a phonecall three months later and was told to come and take his passport. He took back his passport at the police station, yet with no explanation.

⁵⁴ Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 14.

The two figures who stood out as the negative recipients of these policies were Dr. Sadýk Ahmet and Ýsmaíl Berif, against whom cases were brought as of January 1990 during an election campaign on the grounds that they distributed campaign literature referring by name to “Turkish minority”; pursuant to which they received subpoenas on charges with:

- ◆ slander and misinformation in Komotini during the last ten days of October 1989, in violation of Articles 245, 320 and 321 of the Criminal Procedure Law, by saying that candidates of New Democracy, Left Coalition, and PASOK parties had created an atmosphere of terror and anarchy; and;
- ◆ violating Article 192 of the Penal Code by “openly or indirectly inciting citizens to violence or creating rifts among the population at the expense of social peace” by the use of the word “Turkish”.⁵⁶

Dr. Ahmet and Mr. Berif were found “not guilty” of slander and misinformation; but “guilty” of disturbing public order as per Article 192 of the Greek Penal Code. They spent 64 days in prison in Thessaloniki; yet the Court of Appeals released them on the condition that they paid their fines of \$2800 and \$1875, respectively, in place of the remainder of their prison terms; Dr. Ahmet was soon elected an independent MP on 8 April 1990.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Ibid. The report also states that the situation was exacerbated during military government in 1990s and even worsened after the 1974 incidents of Cyprus; when the Greek government expressed that Turkey would attempt to invade Western Thrace and some Greek islands. See appendix C.

⁵⁶ Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁷ Whitman, *Destroying Ethnic Identity*, pp. 21. For the details of the hearing in the Greek Court, see also *Dr. Ahmet’in Þahsýnda Batý Trakya Türkleri Yargýlanýyor* (Ýstanbul: Batý Trakya Türkleri Dayanýþma Derneði, 1991); *the Turkish Dossier - The Western Thrace Turks Issue in Turkish-Greek Relations* (Ýstanbul: International Affairs Agency, 1992); see also “Batý Trakya Olaylarý,” in *Batý Trakya*, vol. 23, no. 258, pp.49-51; “Batý Trakya Türkleri’nin Lideri Dr. Sadýk Ahmet’in 29 Ocak’la Ýlgili Olarak Yayýnladýđý Mesaj,” in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi*, no. 38, January 1992, pp. 3; and “Dr. Sadýk Ahmet’in Dokunulmazlýđý Kaldýrýlmak Ýsteniyor,” in *ibid.*, pp. 4. Dr. Sadýk Ahmet passed away in a traffic accident on 24 July 1995 in Western Thrace, an incident on which there is still dispute about whether it was “organized” or it was a real accident. For the related discussion see Hatipođlu, *Yunanistan’da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 39.

On the other hand, Turks of Western Thrace are known to have complained that their religious freedom had been violated through refusal of permission to repair and/or to build old mosques, denial of the right to choose muftis and through efforts to control the minority's wakfs.⁵⁸ To cite but a couple of examples, it is known that on 4 February 1989, the Nomark of Komotini wrote that permission from the Greek Archbishop was required in order to build a mosque (see Appendix D), and in the village of Diomilia in the outskirts of Xanthi, exists an old mosque among many others, which has been waiting for permission of repair for 25 years.⁵⁹

Restrictions in political and social life such as those noticed in degrading treatment by the security forces, freedom of expression, license acquisition and restraints in business and professional life are reported to be the components of the sufferings of the Turkish minority. Greek security forces frequently call in Turks for interrogation, who assist outside observers; magazines and newspapers from Turkey would not be permitted entry until recently, air and land traffic was heralded during 1989 elections and Turkish-Greek border crossings were closed shortly prior to the elections to keep Turks from returning to vote, Turks are rarely allowed to obtain driving licenses; there are reportedly no Turkish-owned factories, gas stations or pharmacies, no

⁵⁸ see Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 26-29 for details. See also Oran, Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batı Trakya Sorunu, pp. 99-103; "Yskeçe Müftüsü'nün Ysyanı", in Batı Trakya, no. 249, 15 January 1988, pp. 23; "Din Adamları Batı Trakya'ya Yine Alınmadı," in Batı Trakya'nın Sesi, vol. 40, March 1992, pp. 5; Selahattin Yıldız, "Müftülük Sorunu," in Batı Trakya, vol. 24, no. 261, pp. 62-63; Ramazan Güçlü, "Trakya Müslümanları ve Atina Devleti," in Batı Trakya, vol. 24, no 261, October -November-December, 1990, pp. 5-8.

⁵⁹ see Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 27.

Turkish high-ranking civil servants. Turks cannot take credit from Greek banks, either.⁶⁰

Apart from those reported, it is also documented that the Greek government's expropriation of land and cemeteries in Western Thrace incited complaints on the minority's end, in that for instance, the government confiscated 3000 to 4000 acres to build the University of Thrace on the outskirts of Komotini. Related with the issue, the Greek Information Office Director Nikos Papaconstantinou stated that "for the establishment of the University, in Komotini 85 % of theland belonged to Muslims,....in Xanthi, 82 % of the appropriated land belonged to Christians. The allegations regarding a discriminatory Greek land policy against the Thracian Muslims have no scientific base whatsoever."⁶¹

3. 4 MACEDONIANS IN GREECE

In geographic terms, the heart of Greek Macedonia is the littoral plain of Thessaloniki, stretching inward, starting from Thermaic Gulf, across which flow the Rivers of Haliakmon, Loudias and Gallikos.⁶² Poulton writes that Macedonia, in

⁶⁰ Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 14; 22-26; 29-30; 36-39. See Oran, "Batý Trakya'daki Müslüman Türk Azınlığı," pp. 161-165; see also idem, Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batý Trakya Sorunu, pp. 108-118.

⁶¹ Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity, pp. 35. See also Salahattin Yıldız, "Yunanistan Hükümeti'nin Gaspettiği Türk Toprakları'na Dair Rapor," in Batý Trakya, vol. 22, no. 254, pp. 3-8; see Oran, Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batý Trakya Sorunu, pp. 120-134. For a selective list of expropriated lands and cemeteries, see appendix E.

⁶² M. B. Sakellariou, Greek Lands in History - Macedonia; 4000 Years of Greek Civilization (Athens: Ekdotike Athenon S. A, 1983), pp. 14.

general terms, is the area surrounded in the north by the Skopska Crna Gora and Shar Planina Mountains; in the east by the Rila and Rhodope Mountains; in the south by the Aegean Coast around Thessaloniki, Mount Olympus and Pindus mountains; and in the west by Ohrid and Prespa lakes.⁶³ The area is a geographic unit located around the Vardar/Axios, the Struma/Strimon and the Mesta/Nestos river valleys, which is referred to as “geographic Macedonia”, comprising of 67,000 square kilometers, divided between the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), Greece and Bulgaria.⁶⁴

Viewed in historical perspective, it has been argued that the mindset which was traced as influential on the official Greek practices and policies in the aftermath of the proclamation of the Greek state, more specifically later in 1880s, has been exemplified by the words of Kharilaos Trikoupis, the former Greek Prime Minister: “When the Great War breaks out, Macedonia will become Greek or Bulgarian, according to who wins... And if we take it, we will make them all Greeks.”⁶⁵ Atrocity in the region by Greeks in parallel terms with this policy in the 19th and 20th centuries have been documented officially as well as scholarly.⁶⁶ The chronological history of

⁶³ Hugh Poulton, Who Are the Macedonians? (London: Hurst & Company, 1995), pp. 1.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Hatipoğlu, quoting Kharilaos Trikoupis, History of Greek People, vol. 14, (Athens), pp. 18., in The Moslem Turks and Slavo-Macedonians of Greece: Denying Ethnic Identities in a Balkan State (Ankara: Offset, 1999), pp. 4.

⁶⁶ Hatipoğlu, in *ibid.*, provides several examples of registered petitions, reports and telegrams pertaining to the attacks conducted by Greeks in the region. For a thorough account of these, see Arşiv Belgelerine Göre Balkanlar'da ve Anadolu'da Yunan Mezalimi, vol. I (Ankara: Başbakanlık Devlet Arşivleri Genel Müdürlüğü Osmanlı Arşivi Daire Başkanlığı, 1995). See a similar documentation, Documents Sur Les Atrocités Grecques: Atrocités Grecques En Macedoine (Sophia: Imprimerie de l'Etat, 1913); Basil C. Gounaris, “Reassessing Ninety Years of Greek Historiography on the ‘Struggle for Macedonia 1904-1908’,” in Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912, Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis eds. (Oxford: Berg, 1997), pp. 25-37; Cihat Özönder, “Balkanlar'da Yokedilmeye Çalışılan Bir Millet: Makedonlar,” in Batı Trakya'nın Sesi, no. 7-8, December-February, 1988-1989, pp. 39-42; Loring M. Danforth, The

Macedonia as of 725 B.C., the year when the Kingdom of Macedon was established, up until the 1913 Treaty of Bucharest, by which the Ottoman Empire lost the territory, reflects Hun, Slav, Bulgarian, Byzantine and Serbian encounters.⁶⁷

As Hill points out⁶⁸, estimates regarding Macedonians in Greek Macedonia vary between 10,000 and 300,000 citing the U.S Department of State accounts' related reference as "under 10,000 to 50,000 or more" and also the Encyclopaedia Britannica Books of the Year 1987 and 1992 as 180,000 and 150,000, respectively, together with Poulton's estimate of 200,000. Historical statistics regarding Macedonian population estimates by Greece is noted with lower figures or even as non-existing as in the Greek census of 1940, wherein Greeks, Turks, Slavs, Vlachs and Jews were observed as constituents of population of Greek Macedonia, but Macedonians.⁶⁹ This practice in fact, though not precisely similar, appears to have a precedent in 1919, when with Article 56 of the Treaty of Neuilly it was stipulated that "a voluntary exchange of populations be made" between Greece and Bulgaria. According to the agreement, ethnic Bulgarians of Greece (=Macedonians) would be exchanged for ethnic Greeks of Bulgaria; however, this voluntary exchange in short term was transformed into a compulsory one by Greece as regards Macedonians, which forced them to emigrate to Bulgaria.⁷⁰ Relevant literature labels new settlements in Greek

Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic Nationalism in a Transnational World (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 28-55; 56-78; 108-141; 142-184.

⁶⁷ Erdođan Öznal, Makedonya Yunan Deđildir (Ankara: Genelkurmay Basýmevi, 1993) pp. 7-8.

⁶⁸ Peter Hill, "Macedonians in Greece and Albania: A Comparative Study of Recent Developments," in Nationalities Papers, vol. 27, no. 1, March 1999, pp. 17-30; and John S. Koliopoulos, "The War Over the Identity and Numbers of Greece's Slav Macedonians," in Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912, Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis eds. (Oxford: Berg, 1997), 39-57.

⁶⁹ Öznal, Makedonya Yunan Deđildir, pp. 29.

⁷⁰ Öznal, Makedonya Yunan Deđildir, pp. 31.

Macedonia as “a great success”⁷¹ in terms of hellenizing the region by those coming from Anatolia after the 1922 Turkish-Greek War. Pursuant to WW I, the Greek practices persisted more or less the same; this time Macedonians were named as “Slavomacedonians” and towards the mid-1920s, all Macedonian names were changed with Greek ones.⁷² Yet, worse proved to be the dictatorship of General Metaxas who took power in 1936 with coup d’état which lasted five years, a period followed by an even worse one: World War II. Metaxas regime viewed the minority as a danger to Greece’s security and many Macedonians were interned from the border regions with Yugoslavia; furthermore night schools were opened to teach adults Slavs Greek.⁷³

The repression was stepped up during the Greco-Italian War in 1940, despite many Macedonians fighting loyally in Greek army against Italians. The ensuing Civil War saw the exodus of many Slavs together with Greek Communist Party (Kommunistiko Komma Elladas) members fleeing to Yugoslavia. In the aftermath of the Civil War, Greek state took such steps as to remove “undesirable aliens” from border regions with Yugoslavia through Decree numbered 2536, dated 1953, enacted to colonize these northern territories “with new colonists having healthy national consciousness”.⁷⁴ By 1954, Papagos government resolved to remove all

⁷¹ see for instance Öznal, Makedonya Yunan Değildir, pp. 33. The author cites the Great Hellen Encyclopaedia, vol. 10, pp. 410.

⁷² Öznal, Makedonya Yunan Değildir, pp. 34.

⁷³ Poulton, The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict (London: Minority Rights Publications, 1991), pp. 177; see also Philip Carabott, “The Politics of Integration and Assimilation vis-à-vis the Slavo-Macedonian Minority of Interwar Greece: From Parliamentary Inertia to Metaxist Repression,” in Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek National Identity Since 1912, Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis, eds. (Oxford: Berg, 1997), pp. 59-78.

⁷⁴ Poulton, The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict, pp. 178. See also Eftihia Voutina, “Population Transfers and Resettlement Policies in Inter-War Europe: The Case of Asia Minor Refugees in Macedonia from an International and National Perspective,” in Ourselves and Others:

Macedonians from official posts in Greek Macedonia and in bordering regions peasants were not permitted to move from their villages; moreover, inhabitants of villages near Lerin, Kostur and Kajlari were asked to publicly confirm before officials that they did not speak Macedonian; which finally led to emigration to Australia or Canada.⁷⁵ Regardless of the type of government in power, whether democratic or military dictatorship of 1967-1974, the official practices with respect to Macedonian minority is observed almost constant which led to the evolution of a Macedonian nationalism stronger among emigrants from Greece, than nationals in Macedonia proper.⁷⁶ It is also acknowledged that the property of those Macedonians who emigrated was confiscated by Greek government by Decree 2536/1953, with Article 19 of the Citizenship Code depriving them of their citizenship, as well. Through another law enacted thereafter, the Greek state decided that the property would be returned to refugees who were “Greek by birth” which required a change in their names. This practice was also observed when Lafter Lajovski, one of the participants of over 100 former refugees, wished to visit Greek Macedonia along with other refugees; but was turned back at the border by Greek officials stating he should change his name to a Greek one if he wanted to enter Greece; his Canadian citizenship apparently did not make any change.⁷⁷

As of 1981, when PASOK came to power with Andreas Papandreou at its head, actions against Macedonians escalated and Papandreou is known to have explicitly

The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912, Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis eds. (London: Berg, 1997), pp. 111-131.

⁷⁵ Poulton, The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict, pp. 179.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Poulton, The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict, pp. 180.

denied the existence of a Macedonian minority stating he would not accept any dialogue on the matter.⁷⁸

The Greek conservative party, Nea Demokratia, on the other hand also continued its hostility to Macedonians and in 1986 set up a monitoring center in Florina to monitor broadcasts from Skopje.⁷⁹

Today it is known that teaching of Macedonian is banned and a Macedonian baby cannot be given a Macedonian name, since the Greek priests who approve birth certificates accept only Greek names.⁸⁰ It is also reported that priests refuse to marry Macedonian couples unless assured no Macedonian dances shall take place, as this displays Macedonian feelings. Stating this “feeling” is also known to have caused two minority activists Christos Sideropoulos and Tasos Boulis to be sentenced to five months imprisonment and a fine of 100,000 drachmas; as these gentlemen stated that they felt “Macedonian”.⁸¹ Also, in 1990 when 54 Macedonians decided to establish a Macedonian Cultural Association in Florina, Greek Courts refused the application as the applicants, they said, presumed there was a Macedonian minority in Greece. Forwarding the case to the European Court of Human Rights, the minority received an answer that the Court considered the aims of the minority clear and legitimate; and convicted Greece. The Macedonian churches in Greece are also reported closed as the Greek Orthodox Church claims the Macedonian church in

⁷⁸ Poulton, *The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict*, pp. 181.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ *Macedonian Minority in Greece*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey, (Ankara, 1999), pp. 8-10.

⁸¹ *Macedonian Minority in Greece*, pp. 10-12. See also “Yunanistan’da Makedon Azınlık Sorunu,” in *Batı Trakya’nın Sesi*, no. 47, February, pp. 15.

Ohrid is legitimate.⁸² In line with this, a Macedonian monk named Nikodimos Tsarknias, who opposed the Greek church was dismissed from his ecclesiastical post due to his identification as a Macedonian.⁸³

After Papandreou's fall from power in 1990, a mass demonstration in Skopje protesting the lack of minority rights for Macedonia was organized. The escalation was even deteriorated with the break-up of Yugoslavia and the proclamation of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia followed suit.⁸⁴ The use of certain country symbols such as the star of Vergina on the Macedonian flag, harnessing nationalism in Greece led to vetoing this new state with the name "Macedonia". Greece saw this provocative, as it is a symbol used by the ancient Macedonian royal dynasty in Greek Macedonia which was found in King Philip's tomb in Greece. Greece also received Skopje's adoption of the image of the Whiter Tower, the symbol of Thessaloniki in Greek Macedonia, on its commemorative currency as "threatening", multiplied by the use of the name "Macedonia" itself, which caused Greeks to think that the new state coveted the relevant Greek territory.⁸⁵ It has been argued that the Macedonian issue was widely articulated by the nationalistic Greek media in its length, projecting the issue on public through a bulk of headlines, distribution of articles, news reports

⁸² Macedonian Minority in Greece, pp. 10-12.

⁸³ Poulton, Who Are the Macedonians?, pp. 170-171.

⁸⁴ Poulton, Who Are the Macedonians?, pp. 170.

⁸⁵ Nikolaos Zahariadis, "Nationalism and Small state Foreign Policy: The Greek response to the Macedonian Issue," in Political Science Quarterly, vol. 109, no. 4, 1994, pp. 647-668, available on <http://www.hri.org/Macedonian-Heritage/downloads/library/Zach9904.pdf>. See also Kyriskos Kentrotis, "Echoes From the Past: Greece and the Macedonian Controversy," in Mediterranean Politics, vol. 1, Richard Gillespie, ed. (London: Pinter, 1994), pp. 98; Thanos Veremis, "The Revival of the 'Macedonian' Question, 1991-1995," in Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912, Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannakakis eds., (Oxford: Berg, 1997), pp. 227-228.

and editorials; most significantly in newspapers of *To Vima*, *Eleftherotypia*, *Eleftheros Typos*, *Kathimerini* and *Macedonia*.⁸⁶

Finally to speak about the attitudes of the society in Greece, it would not be erroneous to suggest that they vary depending on political affiliation or personal perceptions. Just as extreme “Greek chauvinists are known to have called for the liquidation of all Macedonians, whether in Greece or elsewhere”⁸⁷, some left-wing and a portion of Greek population sympathize with Macedonians which might entail there exists amicable relations between Greeks and Macedonians in Greece, despite cases reported.⁸⁸

3.5 ALBANIANS IN GREECE

Ethnic Albanians in Greece can be categorized in three groups: 1) Orthodox Albanians, 2) Cham Albanians and 3) migrant Albanian nationals who seek refuge in Greece for economic reasons.⁸⁹ In general however, Albanians have come to be believed to be of Illyrian origins, one of the ancient peoples of the Balkan peninsula.⁹⁰ A number of dimensions and restraints involved in wider Greek-

⁸⁶ Nicolas Demertzis *et al.*, “Media and Nationalism: The Macedonian Question,” in *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics*, vol. 4, no. 3, 1999, pp. 26-50, available on [www.jhupress.jhu.edu/home.html](http://jhupress.jhu.edu/home.html).

⁸⁷ Hill, “Macedonians in Greece and Albania”, pp. 17-30.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ *Ethnic Albanians In Greece*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey (Ankara: 1999), pp. 2.

⁹⁰ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan’da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 99.

Albanian relations have been described by Hall as significant as to project the strained nature of relations between the two states on the issues of mutual minorities as well.⁹¹ First, Greeks tend to perceive Albanians as “Islamic”, historically associating them with the Ottoman rule, which leads to viewing them as an implicit threat to Greek Orthodoxy. Second, Greeks have been known to claim that the treatment of the ethnic Greeks in Albania reflects violation of human rights, while Albanians have traditionally been fearful of Greek irredentism in the region. Third, Greece views Albania as a source of military threat, be it directly or be it through third parties, in that, it accuses Albania of having assisted Greek communists during the Civil War and, it is also known that Greece was attacked by fascist Italy in WW II from Albanian territory. Fourth, labor migration to Greece by Albanians seeking better economic and social standards became an issue and raised the level of attention drawn to Greece’s minority rights record. Fifth, the unfavorable Greek attitude towards newly born FYROM, which had been touched upon in the previous section, coupled with an even stronger dubious attitude as regards the position of ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, FYROM and Montenegro, with a number of issues of mutual interest between the countries involved. Sixth, while Greek entrepreneurs engaged in economic reinvigoration in Southern Albania, the Greek state as opposed to that, held up EU assistance for Albania on the grounds that Albania mistreated Greek minority in its territory, also resenting at Italy’s increasing ties with and domination of Albania in trade.⁹²

⁹¹ Derek R. Hall, “Recent Developments in Greek-Albanian Relations,” in Mediterranean Politics, pp. 82-83.

⁹² Ibid.

Related with the first point, it is known for example that within the Ottoman Empire, when revolt attempts by Greek nationalists would give signals, Albanians would be sent in to subdue the turmoil, which later incited Greeks to think the Albanians obstructed Greek independence.⁹³ Today, the Greek attitude towards Orthodox Albanians reflects similarity with that pertaining to other minorities in the country, that is, they claim those Orthodox Albanians as “Greek”, leaving aside their ethnic origins.

Regarding the population of ethnic Albanians in its territory, Greece announced two figures which belong to 1928 and 1951, reflecting the number of “those speaking Albanian” as 18,773 and 22,736, respectively; yet it is argued that subsequent censuses do not refer by name to the minority, in line with the claims of homogeneity of the country and its people.⁹⁴

In geographic terms, Albanians, who refer to themselves as “Shiqiptar”, to their country as “Shqipëri”, and to their language as “Arberishtja”, are traced to be localized in Albania, Kosovo, FYROM and in the regions of Epirus, Thesprotia (Chameria), Attica, Islet of Angistri; and in the island of Egina in Greece.⁹⁵

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 100. On the Albanians' end, it has been posited by Democratic Chameria League that they amount to 100,000, while Föderalistische Union Europaischer Volksgruppen - FUEV (Federal Union of European Nationalities - FUEN) gives an approximate figure, 95,000. See Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 189 for details. For a historical account of Greco-Albanian issue with various aspects, see Léon Maccas, *La Question Gréco-Albanaise* (Nancy: Berger-Levrault, 1921).

⁹⁵ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 101, writes that “Shiqiptari” means people “of eagle-like origin”; and that following the Danubian Basin as of 1st century B.C, the Illyrians came to Epirus and to the coastal territories of Adriatic; later fighting against Hellenes, Romans, Byzantines, Bulgarians, Serbs and Venetians. By 11th century, they became to be known as “Albanians” who in 15th century came under the Ottoman rule. It was in 1912-1913 London Ambassadors Conference that the borders of Albania were specified, annexing Southern Epirus to Greece and the ensuing WW I caused many emigrations from Greece. Hatipoğlu also states that through the Convention Regarding

It has been posited that the Albanians tended to become hellenicized due to the Greek education and political system.⁹⁶ By the same token, the Greek Helsinki reports underscore that army and urbanization have also been the most effective mechanisms of hellenization, aided by judiciary system ready to “denounce and punish all forms of behavior inconsistent with the state’s nationalist culture”.⁹⁷ As Hatipoğlu and Poulton point out, the massive Albanian community in Greece could speak their mother tongue publicly and they had their own established court in Plaka.⁹⁸ Yet, later on, the situation was visibly altered with WW II, when Greece claimed that Albanians had cooperated with fascist Italians against Greece; Albanians were later deported in masses or exiled to other regions in the country.

Today, the use of the Albanian language is banned; moreover it is known that there has been a rather widespread indifference among Albanians about the fate of their mother tongue along with self-depreciation in that, “they have been led by the dominant unilingual Greek culture to believe that these languages are deficient, lack proper grammatical structure, have a poor vocabulary”.⁹⁹ Now and then, it is also observed that young people discourage their parents from using the language in public, causing the middle-aged and elderly people of the minority to use the language, while a much less younger generation usually addressing older people in family context to make fun of non-speakers of Greek speak Albanian.¹⁰⁰

Exchange of Greek-Turkish Population, many Muslim Albanians were sent to Turkey along with Turks.

⁹⁶ Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 189.

⁹⁷ see www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index.html, where Kitromilides is cited.

⁹⁸ Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 189 and, Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan’da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 103.

⁹⁹ see www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index.html.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

Albanians have been seen as dispersed throughout Greece exiled, or hellenicized; nevertheless, since 1980s, efforts to preserve the culture have been made whereby four associations were created: *Arvanitikos Syndesmos Hellados* (the Arvanite League of Greece), *Kentro Arvanitikou Politismou* (Center for Arvanite Culture), *Arvanitikos Syllagos Ano Liosion* (Arvanite Association of Ano Liosia), and *Syllagos Arvaniton Corinthas* (Association of Arvanites of Corinthia).¹⁰¹

As regards Cham Albanians, it is shown that between 1921 and 1926, Greece began to deport Muslim Albanians from Chameria, so as to designate their lands to Greeks coming from Anatolia.¹⁰² In 1924, the League of Nations protested about the deportation of the Chams, with no result. In 1944, the process was repeated since the Greek government was determined to establish ethnically homogeneous border regions whereby approximately 35,000 Cham Albanians fled to Albania, Turkey or to other regions in Greece. The championing figure of this process was General Napoleon Zervas, opposed to both the communist EAM - ELAS groups and non-Greek elements in Greece.¹⁰³ Within this period, on 27 June 1944, Greek criminal bands engaged in the worst ethnic cleansing in the town of Paramyty.¹⁰⁴

After the war, the Albanian government forwarded the issue to Paris Peace Conference which soon recognized the plight of Chams and demanded repatriation

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Hall, "Recent Developments in Greek-Albanian Relations", pp. 87-88.

¹⁰³ Hatipoğlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 104. EAM - ELAS refers to *Ethniko Apeleftherotiko Metopo* - *Ethnikos Laikos Apeleftherotikos Stratos* (=National Liberation Front - National Peoples Liberation Army).

¹⁰⁴ For details see *Ethnic Albanians in Greece*, pp. 7-8.

and recovery of their property.¹⁰⁵ The Parliament of the Albanian Republic proclaimed 27 June 1944 as the Commemoration Day for the Massacred Albanians of Chameria and a related monument was built up in Konispol.¹⁰⁶ Former Greek Prime Minister Mitsotakis in a speech delivered in Tirana in 1992 stated that Cham Albanians were war criminals as they had cooperated with Germany and Italy in WW II and would not be permitted to return to Greece; despite the fact that Cham Albanians were loyally fighting against the Axis powers, and that they had been the first group to resist the Italian invasion.¹⁰⁷

With a view to modifying the demographic mosaic in Chameria, Greece localized the region with Greeks, Vlachs and the Roma, in the aftermath of WW II, as it appeared to the Greek government that the province would remain dubious with the Albanian population left therein.¹⁰⁸

On the other hand, Greece saw an influx of Albanian migrants seeking better economic conditions, pursuant to the collapse of communist regime in Albania in 1991. As Hall stresses, those immigrants with family connections in Greece could more or less integrate themselves relatively easily, however, others rather found themselves constituting a lower class in society and economy, usually becoming scapegoats for increasing incidents of crime¹⁰⁹, also they were used by some Greeks

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ For details, see Hatipođlu, *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar*, pp. 107; and *Ethnic Albanians in Greece*, pp. 8. See also "Simitis, Pandora's Box", Excerpt from "Shekuli", 25 December 1999, available on <http://www.turk-yunan.gen.tr/english/minority/index.html>

¹⁰⁸ *Ethnic Albanians in Greece*, pp. 9. See also "The Cham Issue is Still a Taboo for Greece", available on <http://www.turk-yunan.gen.tr/english/minority/index.html>.

¹⁰⁹ Hall, "Recent Developments in Greek-Albanian Relations", pp. 89.

in black market and smuggling, by which Albanians were described willing to be exploited as they could make more money in such a way than in Albania.¹¹⁰

By December 1991, the Government began expulsions of illegal immigrants which through “Operation Scooba” amounted to 100,000; the reasons for Greece for the removal of Albanians were at least three-fold: 1) Albanians were causing saturation in Greek labor market and thus unemployment, 2) their crime record appeared more than the average, and 3) Greece was concerned on the issue of awakening of Islam in post-communist Albania and its possible impact on Greek Orthodox state.¹¹¹

The Greek police is said to have exerted physical violence and deported approximately 300,000 Albanian nationals who had in fact obtained required documents in the 1990s, furthermore, their savings and personal belongings were said to be confiscated.¹¹² Apart from these, reports indicate that Albanians who accepted Greek citizenship and Orthodoxy were given work permits and even in some cases Greek passports.¹¹³ Citing Eugenia Droukas, Hatipoğlu¹¹⁴ writes that Albanians faced the same treatment as “*Helots*” of the antique period; *Helots* being those belonging to the lowest stratum in the society in ancient Greece, likening the term to the situation of the Turks in Germany which was once seen as such. On the other hand, it has been argued that Albanians along with other illegal immigrants in general are valuable, and even essential for small businesses’ survival, especially in

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Hall, “Recent Developments in Greek-Albanian Relations”, pp. 90.

¹¹² Ethnic Albanians in Greece, pp. 10-11.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Hatipoğlu, Yunanistan’da Etnik Gruplar, pp. 112, citing Eugenia Droukas, “Albanians in the Greek Informal Economy,” in Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, vol. 24, no. 2, April 1998, pp. 359.

agriculture.¹¹⁵ The same argument goes on to maintain that the “dangerous Albanian” stereotype was in fact invented initially by the Greek police and reinforced by the media and subsequently by the state, rather than the society itself.¹¹⁶

In general terms, Greece’s far-fetched perception that Greeks have no link or intermingling in any form or shape with any ethnic group in their vicinity manifests itself unchanged in the treatment of Albanians, too.¹¹⁷ In 2000, a 15-year-old boy named Odysseus Cenai, invoked much debate as to whether an Albanian boy should carry the Greek flag in a national day parade. The boy happened to excel in his school, Nea Mihaniona High School in Thessaloniki, yet stayed at home instead of leading his school in the parade. Greek Justice Minister Evangelos Yannopoulos insisted that the flag could only be carried by Greeks on a national day. Ironically, the Greek Ministry of Education dictates that the student who has the best grades gets to lead the National Day Parade on October 28. However, despite his Greek name and the Greek education he received, Odysseus Cenai was not allowed to carry the flag, and had to leave the task to a Greek student at school.¹¹⁸

3. 6 VLAHS IN GREECE (KOUTSOVLAHS OR AROMANIANS)

¹¹⁵ Martin Baldwin - Edward and Constantina Satlios - Rothschild, “Immigration and Unemployment in Greece: Perceptions and Realities,” in South European Society and Politics, vol. 4, no. 3, Winter 1993, pp. 214. See also Gazmend Kapllani, “Albanian Municipal Elections and Emigrants in Greece,” AIM Athens, 26 September 2000, available on www.aimpress.org.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Alexis Heraklides, “Greeks and Albanians in Greece,” AIM Athens, 7 December 2000, available on www.aimpress.org.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

Vlahs are those Latin people who speak a form of Romanian, living mostly in Pindus mountains, Epirus, Thessaly and Greek Macedonia. As regards population figures, emigré Vlahs claim approximately 600,000 Vlahs to be living in Greece; and the Federal Union of European Nationalities put the figure as 300,000, while the 1935 and 1951 censuses in Greece showed 19,703 and 39,855 Vlahs in the country.¹¹⁹ Vlahs are mostly Hellenophile and are almost all Orthodox; they tend to identify themselves with Greeks owing to the Greek education they receive; yet those who do not feel so are known to have emigrated causing a much stronger nationalist feeling in the diaspora.¹²⁰ Apparently, there is no separatist movement among Vlahs in Greece, despite rarely reported hostility from nationalistic sections in Greek society against the use of Vlah language.¹²¹ It has been reported that Sotiris Bletsas of the Vlah minority was arrested in 1995 after distributing European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages (EBLUL) publications; which invoked the European Commission to ask the Greek government for more information on the conviction of the activist.¹²² Just as Albanian language is discouraged to be used; so is the Vlah; although since 1984, an annual Vlah festival is organized in which Vlahs songs and dances are performed.¹²³ It might be posited that Vlahs are not viewed as threatening element against Hellenic unity, which is more neatly seen in the words of Greek President Kostas Stephanopoulos when he praised the patriotic spirit of Vlahs during his two-day visit in Pindus in 1998; emphasizing that the region was the backbone of

¹¹⁹ Poulton, The Balkans, pp. 189-190. Also "The Vlahs", on www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index/html for Vlahs in Greek history up to date.

¹²⁰ Poulton, The Balkans, pp. 191.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² "European Commission Asks for More Information About Conviction of Greek Language Activist," available on <http://www.aromanian.net/greece.html>

¹²³ Poulton, The Balkans, pp. 191; and "The Vlahs", on www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index/html.

Greece with its people constituting the backbone of Hellenism.¹²⁴ Still, the official viewpoint holds that “the Vlachs are those Greek people who speak an unusual dialect.”¹²⁵

3. 7 POMAKS IN GREECE

Pomaks live in Western Thrace, with a population of around 30,000 and their language “Pomakika/Pomakçi” belongs to the Bulgaro-Macedonian linguistic group.¹²⁶ They are officially recognized as a Muslim minority in accordance with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne. Despite certain arguments asserting that very little is known about historical origins of Pomaks’ evolution¹²⁷, there indeed exists relevant literature on the issue, yet with remarkable controversy, in that, Bulgarian, Greek and Turkish sources all refer to Pomaks as their respective national components. The Greek scholars are observed to consider Pomaks “to be the descendants of ancient Thracian tribes which were in turn Hellenized, Latinized, Slavized, Christianized and finally Islamized.”¹²⁸

Pomaks tend to identify themselves with Turks, which has been argued as “helped by Greece” in 1951 to introduce Turkish education for Pomaks in an effort to dissociate them from Bulgarians.¹²⁹ Yet, currently the Pomaks resent new attempts of Greek

¹²⁴Birgül Demirtaş-Coşkun, *The Vlachs: A Forgotten Minority in the Balkans*(London: F. Cass, 2001)

¹²⁵ Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 191.

¹²⁶ see www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index.html.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

¹²⁹ see “Pomaks” available on <http://www.turkses.com/culture/Pomak-eng/pomak-genis.htm>; Hüseyin Memişoğlu, *Pomak Türkleri’nin Tarihi Geçmişinden Sayfalar* (Ankara: İsfak, 1991); Cihat Özönder,

authorities since 1994 to dissociate them from Turks as Greece holds the view that “...schoolbooks come directly from Turkey, all the Turkish TV channels pour out the Kemalic venom on the region, alienating the cultural structure of the Pomak peculiarity.”¹³⁰ In 1999 deputy Stavros Xarhakos of Nea Demokratia submitted a question to the European Parliament pinpointing “the odd Greeks tactics of forcing Pomaks to be taught in Turkish schools, and thus their Turkification, instead of promoting their peculiarity”, and questions if this is in line with EU principles and goals, a question of self-critique whose second half requires consideration by Greece, regarding all its minorities, and not only the Pomaks.¹³¹

3. 8 THE ROMA (GYPSIES) IN GREECE

Living in Greek Macedonia, Western Thrace and Athens specifically, the Roma community is estimated as 140,000 by outside observers, while Greek officials give far lower figures.¹³² Tong writes that although Gypsies prefer nomadic life styles, there are many exceptions in Greece such as stable factory workers or sharecroppers; yet still living under pressures of poverty, a fact about which the Gypsies make irony and call their ghetto in Thessaloniki “Little Paris”.¹³³

“Pomak Türkleri,” in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi*, no.4, May-June, 1994, pp. 16-19; Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 182-183; Yücel, *Dýþ Türkler*, pp. 109-110; Mario Apostolou, “The Pomaks: A Religious Minority in the Balkans,” available on http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/iec03/iec03_14_96.html; Mehmet Hakses, “Pomak Türklerinde Soyadları,” in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi*, no. 6, September-October, 1988, pp. 34; Paul Hýdyroglou, *The Greek Pomaks And Their Relation With Turkey* (Athens: Proskinio, 1991).

¹³⁰ Panayotis Dumas, “A Victory for the Greek Pomaks,” available on http://www.egrammes.gr/2001/07/pomaks_en.htm.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 188.

¹³³ Diane Tong, “Photographing Gypsies,” in *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1992, pp. 98-99.

After visiting Roma camps in Greece in 2001, Josephine Vespaget, Chair of the Specialist Group on Roma of the Council of Europe, stated that there was “institutionalized apartheid for many Roma in Greece whereby they were forcefully settled in segregated areas isolated from the rest of the society, referring to Article 3.1 of a 1983 Ministerial decision.¹³⁴ Minority Rights Group in 1999 also reported that the local Greek authorities evicted Roma families in Evamos, Ano Liossia, Ioannina, Trikala and Phoenikas.¹³⁵ Similarly, as Poulton argues, a 1979 law passed to enable the Muslim Roma to obtain identity cards had little effect due to lacking birth certificates; as these people have only in practice been accepted as Greek citizens after baptism by the Orthodox church.¹³⁶ Parallel to the European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) report that confirms Greece’s evictions without providing alternative accommodation and also exclusion of the Roma from citizenship rights¹³⁷, the Greek delegation in OSCE Implementation Meeting on Human Dimension in Warsaw in 1998, accepted Roma’s situation with accuracy: “I wish to state in all honesty that I cannot....justify the unjustifiable.....we do recognize that the situation of Roma in Greece is still far from satisfactory.....”¹³⁸

¹³⁴ “The lands for the organized encampments of the itinerant nomads (Gypsies, etc.) which are going to be designated, in accordance with the article 2 of the present ordinance, must be outside the inhabited areas and in good distance from the approved urban plan or the last consecutive house...Settlement is not permitted near archaeological sites, beaches, places of natural beauty, points visible from main roads or in areas where they might affect public health (sources of drinking water, etc.)”, from “Statement to the 2001 OSCE Implementation Meeting Working Session on ‘Roma’”, 20 September 2001, available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>.

¹³⁵ Ibid. These neighborhoods are in Thessaloniki, Attica, Epiros, Thessaly and Thessaloniki, respectively.

¹³⁶ Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 188.

¹³⁷ see “Council of Europe Finds Racism in Greece” and; “Greece: Racially Motivated Arson on a Roma Hut in Nea Kios,” available on <http://www.eurasianet.org/resource/regional/ihf-greece.html>.

¹³⁸ “Report on Greece to the OSCE Review Conference 1999,” 22 September available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>.

Although recently a City Municipality Network for Gypsy Citizens was created together with a 1996 Program of Social Integration of Greek Gypsies and an Ombudsman Office to better the situation of Roma; it is evident that the Roma are at the lowest stratum of social structure in Greece, as elsewhere in the world.¹³⁹

3. 9 JEWS IN GREECE

The Jewish population in Greece is estimated as around 5,000; most of them living in Thessaloniki and Athens.¹⁴⁰ According to Strabo, Jewish presence in Greece dates to 85 B.C; yet it was in 1492 when Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain proclaimed the Edict of Expulsion for the Jews of Spain that over 20,000 Sephardic and Iberian Jews arrived in Thessaloniki in masses after Sultan Bayezid II proclaimed the exiled Jews would be welcome in the Ottoman Empire.¹⁴¹ Lewkowicz, among many in the related literature, states that Jews enjoyed liberty among the Turks; pointing to the relative absence of anti-Ottoman sentiments among Jewish Greeks; while Orthodox Greeks associated the Ottoman rule with “four hundred years of slavery”.¹⁴² Lewkowicz¹⁴³ and Goldberg¹⁴⁴ commonly posit that although almost every Jew faced times of anti-Semitic prejudice in Greece, the majority of Jews do not consider

¹³⁹ Poulton, *The Balkans*, pp. 189.

¹⁴⁰ Hannah Goldberg, “On Anti-Semitism In Greece,” AIM Athens, 7 December 2000, available on www.aimpress.org

¹⁴¹ For a thorough historical background analysis of Jews of Greece, see <http://www.greecetravel.com.jewishhistory/ancient.html> and; Adina Weiss Liberles, “The Jewish Community of Greece,” in *The Balkan Jewish Communities*, Daniel J. Elazar *et al.* eds., (Lanham: University of America Press, 1984), pp. 102-126.

¹⁴² see Bea Lewkowicz, “ ‘Greece is My Home, But...’: Ethnic Identity of Greek Jews in Thessaloniki,” in *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, vol. 4, no. 2, 1994, pp. 233.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Goldberg, “On Anti-Semitism in Greece,” available on www.aimpress.org.

Greece an anti-Semitic state, while Goldberg labels Greek anti-Semitism “utterly subliminal”, so difficult to pinpoint, but less difficult to combat.¹⁴⁵

During WW II Greece deported more than 65,000 Jews in 1943 to concentration camps despite protests of Greek intellectual and some religious leaders and in the ensuing years anti-Semitic sentiments persisted with the Panellinion Sosialistikon Kinema (PASOK) period, harboring much of the sentiment, when for instance Greece saw extreme right organizations, the press and other literature replete with comparison of Jews to Nazis during Israeli invasion of Lebanon, naming them “worthy descendants of Hitler”; and one socialist MP accusing “the Jews, the Masons and the CIA” for 1967 *coup d’état* in Greece.¹⁴⁶

Anti-Semitic incidents in Greece are in general attacks on Jewish monuments, Swastikas and Nazi slogans written and painted on walls, houses and cemeteries of Jews and occasional anti-Semitic remarks of Church officials and MPs.¹⁴⁷ To cite one, as Smith reports, the crisis over civilian identity cards in Greece showed once again that Athens was the target of criticism by European Court of Human Rights for violations involving religious minorities, whereby Jews along with others were negative recipients; in an atmosphere where one million Greeks cheered Archbishop Christodoulas in 2000 saying “Our faith is our foundation of identity. If you abolish one, you abolish the other.”¹⁴⁸ Also on the 62nd anniversary of “Kristallnacht” in

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ see “Greece” available on <http://www.axt.org.uk/antidem/archive/archive2/greece/greece.htm>; see also Daniel Perdurant, “Antisemitism in Contemporary Greek Society,” available on <http://www2huji.ac.il/www-jcd/acta.html>.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Helena Smith, “The Misery of Being Greek,” available on <http://www.alb.net.com/pipermail/albsa-info/2000-August/000495.html>. The ID cards issue turned into a crisis in Greece in the fall of 2000, bringing against on the one hand the state trying to reconcile with EU standards; and on the other the

Germany, a commemoration day against racism¹⁴⁹ (9 November 1938), the Minority Rights Group - Greece and Greek Helsinki Monitor stated that the question by the anti-Semite MP Georgos Karatzaferis in November 2000 to Prime Minister Costas Simitis was the proof for present anti-Semitic sentiments in the Parliament. Karatzaferis asked the Prime Minister to publicly disclose if his daughter married in a synagogue according to Jewish rituals and, if so, why it happened in secret. Karatzaferis went on to argue that “when the father of the bride happens to be the Prime Minister and the wedding ceremony coincides with a period when the Orthodox Greek is feeling that his faith is being persecuted by governmental actions, this raises questions that must be examined”, evidently disturbed by the concurrent identity cards issue in Greece at the time. It has been argued that the question did receive almost no condemnation, including the Central Board of Jewish Communities of Greece, characterizing the subliminal nature of anti-Semitism among Greek populace according to Goldberg, one which has “subtly and profoundly” permeated the psyche of Greeks to such an extent that even the most enlightened would not recognize.¹⁵⁰

Church, the right-wing affiliations and relevant public opinion. The confrontation was whether to remove any reference to religion on the ID cards or not.

¹⁴⁹ November 9 is the international day designated to commemorate the Jewish slaughter in Germany of 9 November 1938, which is called “Kristallnacht”. For details see “Press Release by Greek Helsinki Monitor” available on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/english/pressrelease/9-11-00.html>.

¹⁵⁰ Goldberg, “On Anti-Semitism in Greece,” available on www.aimpress.org. As Perdurant pinpoints related with the issue, the 1986 *Hellenobarometer* showed that 57% Greeks said that they did not trust Jews; 41% would avoid a Jewish boss; 43% would avoid a Jewish doctor; 49% would not vote for a Jewish candidate for Parliament. Daniel Perdurant, “Antisemitism in Contemporary Greek Society,” available on <http://www2huji.ac.il/www-jcd/acta.html>.

Last but not least, the Catholic Christians' complaints are among those who claim that the Church and the State discriminate them against Orthodox Greeks and the Catholic Church is seen as "foreign domination" lacking "legality".¹⁵¹

It is seen that the Greek treatment of minorities do reflect a multitude of policies and practices, yet it would be recognized that this variety stems from the constant fashion of viewing minorities as elaborated; therefore, the result represents itself in uniform pattern(s). Assimilation, expulsion and denial of ethnic identity/existence stand as the common practices for Greece, yet still, they appear to be exacerbated by a couple of factors present in contemporary Greek societal structure, which would help formulating a general analytical evaluation of the matter in the final section.

¹⁵¹ see "The Catholic Church in Greece," available on <http://www.interkriti.net/ccc/004.htm>; and Kathy Tzilivakis, "Non-Orthodox Christians Have Complaints About Greek Church," available on <http://athensnews.gr>.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYTICAL EVALUATION OF GREECE'S MINORITY-RELATED POLICIES

Provided in length in the previous section, Greek minority policies may lead us to recognize, as Kuzio posits, that Greece in fact does not fall into the group of western European states defined as “civic”, as it does not provide polyethnic rights, like France, but unlike Spain, for instance¹. Much of what relates to ‘civic’ state is seen to be framed around the idea of granting all the citizenship rights regardless of ethnicity; a liberal democracy whereby ethnicity is not a factor in states’ policies, one which recognizes individual rights.² It might also be argued that the ‘ethnic’ and nationalising states of post-communism might not be the only states in their vicinities in Europe, as the record seems to be mixed on the question as abovementioned; rendering Greece an ‘ethnic’ state, although accepted Western. On the other hand, it can be posited, that perhaps the content and the definition of civic state might require reconsideration or even reformulation; since there exist many civic states that pursue varying degrees of homogenizing policies; just as the case in Greece. One might infer that a clearly defined theoretical framework on the issue still

remains to be reformulated,³ as civic states of Western Europe see in them occasional ups in nationalistic tendencies; as the most recent elections in France showed inclination toward that direction.

Deemed as belonging to the West by Europe itself, Greece in fact does not display traits of “Westernness” in the assumed sense when it comes to its national minority issues owing to the reasons cited in the previous section. Yet still, at least two more elements contributing to the exacerbation of classic Greek perception of minorities might necessitate attention to better comprehend the analysis of the issue at hand: media and civil society in Greece.

4.1 THE GREEK MEDIA: BREEDING HATRED?

The coverage of minority issues by Greek media has been traced as “providing (dis)information based on one and only source; the corresponding specialized agencies”; in specific terms, appearing mostly on the newspapers of largest circulation in Greece; the conservative daily *Kathimerini*, liberal weekly *To Vima*, liberal daily *Ta Nea*, weekly *Economicos Tachydromos* have been reported as engaging in “hate speech” against minorities.⁴

¹ Taras Kuzio, “‘Nationalising States’ or Nation-Building? A Critical Review of the Theoretical Literature and Empirical Evidence” in *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 7, part 2, no. 2, 2001, pp. 135-154.

² Ibid. Kuzio cites Brubaker’s definition of the term, pp. 138.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Panayote Dimitras, “Greece’s Hate Media Breed Popular Hate Culture,” AIM Athens, 21 February 1998, available on www.aimpress.org.

Dimitras exemplifies that, on January 1992, *Kathimerini* wrote there were 250,000 “pure Greeks” living in the area of Skopje; while *Economicos Tachydromos*, on 1 July 1993, engaged in a character slandering campaign against Greek anthropologist Tasoula Karakasidou renowned for her studies on Macedonians in Greece, claiming she had sided with enemy; on the other hand; *Ta Nea*, on 27 January 1995, accused Agence France Presse - Athens bureau chief Alain Navarro for having depicted “an alleged anti-Semitic climate which prevails in Greece”.⁵ Dimitras further notes that almost no intellectual or politician showed reaction to such hate speech in the media, which had more repeated examples.⁶

The Greek media has been criticized for being interested in misinforming, and not in accurate informing of their readership, leading in turn to deception; although the government in late 1990s repeatedly claimed it was inclined to implement a pragmatic foreign policy, which proved unhelped by Greek media.

In line with this, when annual State Department Human Rights Report was released on 30 January 1998, *Ta Nea* headline read “They even discovered a Slav-speaking minority in Greece” on the following day; while liberal *Exousia* wrote “False step by the US State Department report”⁷. Also, on 18-19 February 1998, *Eleftherotypia*’s Thessaloniki correspondent wrote that MP status of Galip Galip (of PASOK) and of Birol Akifoğlu (of *Nea Demokratia*) should be abolished as they dared declare they represented Turkish minority; an idea which came to be embraced by conservative daily *Eleftheros Typos* on 19 February 1998 and by overtly “racist, fascist and

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

ultranationalist” weekly *Shotos* on 18 February 1998; displaying a shared affirmation on the issue, regardless of their political ideologies.⁸ Similar thoughts were flawed in the same year in mid-February when famous Greek singer Stelios Kazantzidis attempted to discredit an equally famous composer, Christos Nikolopoulos, by means of anti-Semitic accusations, claiming him “agent of Jews”; the pursuant classic silence of intellectuals, media and journalists led composer Mikis Theodorakis to increase his voice and argue that racism of zombis was a disgrace for Greece and “silence was guilt”.⁹ However, it was Theodorakis this time who was acutely condemned; *Eleftherotypia*’s headline on 16 February 1998 read “Theodorakis for Jews”.

A parallel confirmation in collective sense is observed on *Kathimerini*’s editorial of 8 August 2001, wherein it is supported that the question of minorities had acquired particular force in the Balkans, a fact which should place the Greek government “on alert”; if Athens is to avoid unpleasant surprises; without specifying what such surprises might be.¹⁰ Dimitras maintains¹¹ that the Greek public culture is “anti-Semitic, racist, extreme nationalist and xenophobic” and that this intolerance generates from tolerance of hate speech in media against “others”, which most probably would lead to massive protests in an other European country.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ “Minorities”, Editorial, *Kathimerini* (English Version), 8 August 2001, available on www.ekathimerini.com. See Nafsika Papanikolatos, “Minorities: Sacrificial Lamb at Greek Democracy’s Silver Jubilee,” AIM Press Athens, 29 July 1999, available on www.aimpress.org for details.

¹¹ Dimitras, “Greece’s Hate Media Breed Popular Hate Culture,” available on www.aimpress.org.

Last but not least, it can be safely posited that apart from the general state and army composition, the nationalism-fueling factions in Greece, specifically the media, is consistent with the education system that teaches to oppose the “other”; putting the society in a position short of reflexes to react; and media clearly acts as a platform of indifference at best and xenophobic rhetoric at worst in Greece, feeding mutually politics, Church, intellectual domain, army, education system and other related circles; leaving Greeks to perceive minority demands as a threat to the Greek state, which in fact is occasionally traced as in the words of Foreign Minister Georgos Papandreou:

There is clearly racism in our country as well. Yet, the causes for Greece possibly differ from those in neighboring countries. There is racism which springs from the acquaintance with the other and racism which is the result of taboos and prejudices without direct contact with the different.¹²

It can thus be seen that a top-stratum figure in the state structure confirming racism in the country, the media has but to back it, as it is supposed to correspond to whatever officially stated: the sign of an unstrengthened democracy and infant civil society.

4. 2 CIVIL SOCIETY AND DEMOCRACY IN GREECE

With the term “civil society” is meant the collection of all institutions and associations that have no affiliation with the government, one which is capable of

¹² Georgos Papandreou, “Two-Day Meeting On Racism in Greece,” 19 June 1995, in Ethnic Albanians in Greece, pp. 4.

questioning government practices. However, the idea of nationalism is mutually served and consolidated between state factions, the Church and the society itself in Greece, rendering these elements too powerful and solid to be contested by the society.¹³

One related recent upheaval, as touched upon in the previous section, was observed in the civil identity cards issue, when Archbishop Christodoulos in one of his speeches stated that those supportive of separation of the state and the Church did not deserve their Greek name and identity.¹⁴ Taking it further, he labeled them “Greeklings”.¹⁵

Any overt disagreement with the widely shared national identity consciousness in Greece is potent to cause a sentiment of diverting from what is shared by the society at large and a due fear of exclusion. This in turn is manifest as a weak democracy as Papanikolatos affirms, with “eloquent silence” of intellectuals, and in the recent reaction of the Greece to the appeal on minority rights on the day Greece celebrated the 25th anniversary of restoration of democracy Greece in 1999; on its Silver Jubilee.¹⁶

Papanikolatos further argues that the constant excessive doses of hypernationalism makes Greeks feel insecure when there are no reasons to and that another

¹³ Dionyssis Goussetis, “National Identity and Civil Society in Greece,” AIM Athens, 23 May 2000, available on www.aimpress.org.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Papanikolatos, “Minorities: Sacrificial Lamb at Greek Democracy’s Silver Jubilee,” available on www.aimpress.org. This day refers to the restoration of Greek democracy which took place in 1974, when Turkey landed troops on Cyprus and the Junta regime collapsed.

opportunity was lost on that symbolic celebration day, to show Greek democracy had eventually grown mature¹⁷; a view shared also by Goussetis, leading to the assumption that Greek democracy, just as Greek civil society, is still infant and remains to be seen if it will finally ripen¹⁸. Pessimistic as it might sound, given the uncontested nature of state and Church, along with other effective institutions; it is seen that state and societal impetuses operate to the detriment of democracy in Greece, which seemingly are in consensus on minority issues; a consensus on recycling the elements of nationalism¹⁹, arguments of homogeneity, in summary, a common anti-minority attitude in general.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Goussetis, "National Identity and Civil Society in Greece", available on www.aimpress.org.

¹⁹ Ibid.

CONCLUSION

PROSPECT FOR GREECE IN THE EU: DISCORD OR CONVERGENCE?

It seems highly unlikely that Greece is bound to replace its deep-rooted tradition of national identity with a European one; accordingly, the driving force behind such opposition appears to be the age-old enshrined need to ensure continued preservation of national uniqueness - one which has come to be assumed by Greeks as granted to them to set a model before others to be civilized as elaborated throughout the 2nd section. However, such self-esteem attributes seem remote to present-day realities; as Greece is accepted as part of an entity called the European Union, with supranational, transnational, and intergovernmental traits, which entail different and simultaneous types of belonging.

Fossum argues¹ in prospect that the EU in future might see four different directions in integration process; the first is a supranational EU based on federal norms and rights which rather reflects the current portrait; the second is an EU as a collection of national cultural communities; the third is an intergovernmental EU as collection of

¹ Jon Erik Fossum, "Identity-Politics in the European Union," available on http://www.arena.uio.no/publication/wp01_17htm.

democratic (rights-oriented) member-states and; the fourth is an EU marked by ‘deep diversity’ rather than coherence, grounded on nationalist claims.

Of these, it might be posited that Greece would take its place in the fourth scenario. The main reason behind this is the failure of Greece to disclose a member-state portrait that acts in accordance with “the plurality of ways of belonging”² to this complex polity and sustain a multitude of attachments, more specifically, the way Greece handles the issues of more technical peculiarity might reflect quite convergent results on its end; however, this would ask for due accord on a wider range of more political matters such as minorities, too, as a requirement of integration philosophy. The argument that the EU is currently rather too technocratic and/or practical to take constructive steps on the matter is another topic on its own right; yet still, it can be assumed that it has sufficient instruments and potential to be effective on its members.

Conversely, from an optimistic perspective, the Greek dilemma in the EU might be reconciled, should Greece embark in a period of compensation of its democratic deficits and denounces classic rhetoric of sacred national identity arguments. Notwithstanding its current political framework which ultimately trades in strong nationalist ideology; such a positive thinking might lead to an expectancy that future generations in Greece’s politics might replace the current stands with democratic involvement which depends largely on social learning that would eventually provide positive modifications on the minorities’ end.

² Ibid.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A^{*}

FRAMEWORK CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL MINORITIES

**(Strasbourg, 1.2.1995)
(The first relevant eighteen articles)**

SECTION 1

Article 1

The protection of national minorities and of the rights and freedoms of persons belonging to those minorities forms an integral part of the international protection of human rights, and as such falls within the scope of international cooperation.

Article 2

The provisions of this framework Convention shall be applied in good faith, in a spirit of understanding and tolerance and in conformity with the principles of good neighborliness, friendly relations and cooperation between States.

Article 3

1. Every person belonging to a national minority shall have the right freely to choose to be treated or not to be treated as such and no disadvantage shall result from the exercise of the rights which are connected to that choice.
2. Persons belonging to national minorities may exercise the rights and enjoy the freedoms flowing from the principles enshrined in the present framework Convention individually as well as in community with others.

SECTION 2

Article 4

1. The Parties undertake to guarantee to persons belonging to national minorities the right of equality before the law and of equal protection of the law. In this respect, any discrimination based on belonging to a national minority shall be prohibited.
2. The Parties undertake to adopt, where necessary, adequate measures in order to promote, in all areas of economic, social, political and cultural life, full and effective equality between persons belonging to a national minority and those belonging to the majority. In this respect, they shall take due account of the specific conditions of the persons belonging to national minorities.
3. The measures adopted in accordance with paragraph 2 shall not be considered to be an act of discrimination.

Article 5

^{*} Available on <http://www.conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/Treaties/Html/157.htm>.

1. The Parties undertake to promote the conditions necessary for persons belonging to national minorities to maintain and develop their culture, and to preserve the essential elements of their identity, namely their religion, language, traditions and cultural heritage.
2. Without prejudice to measures taken in pursuance of their general integration policy, the Parties shall refrain from policies or practices aimed at assimilation of persons belonging to national minorities against their will and shall protect these persons from any action aimed at such assimilation.

Article 6

1. The Parties shall encourage a spirit of tolerance and intercultural dialogue and take effective measures to promote mutual respect and understanding and cooperation among all persons living on their territory, irrespective of those persons' ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, in particular in the fields of education, culture and the media.
2. The Parties undertake to take appropriate measures to protect persons who may be subject to threats or acts of discrimination, hostility or violence as a result of their ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity.

Article 7

The Parties shall ensure respect for the right of every person belonging to a national minority to freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, freedom of expression, and freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

Article 8

The Parties undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to manifest his or her religion or belief and to establish religious institutions, organizations and associations.

Article 9

1. The Parties undertake to recognize that the right to freedom of expression of every person belonging to a national minority includes freedom to hold opinions and to receive and impart information and ideas in the minority language, without interference by public authorities and regardless of frontiers. The Parties shall ensure, within the framework of their legal systems, that persons belonging to a national minority are not discriminated against in their access to the media.
2. Paragraph 1 shall not prevent Parties from requiring the licensing, without discrimination and based on objective criteria, of sound radio and television broadcasting, or cinema enterprises.
3. The Parties shall not hinder creation and the use of printed media by persons belonging to national minorities. In the legal framework of sound radio and television broadcasting, they shall ensure, as far as possible, and taking into account the provisions of paragraph 1, that persons belonging to national minorities are granted the possibility of creating and using their own media.
4. In the framework of their legal systems, the Parties shall adopt adequate measures in order to facilitate access to the media for persons belonging to national minorities and in order to promote tolerance and permit cultural pluralism.

Article 10

1. The Parties undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to use freely and without interference his or her minority language, in private and in public, orally and in writing.
2. In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, if those persons so request and where such a request

corresponds to a real need, the Parties shall endeavor to ensure, as far as possible, the conditions which would make it possible to use the minority language in relations between those persons and the administrative authorities.

3. The Parties undertake to guarantee the right of every person belonging to a national minority to be informed promptly, in a language which he or she understands, of the reasons for his or her arrest, and of the nature and cause of any accusation against him or her, and to defend himself or herself in this language, if necessary with free assistance of an interpreter.

Article 11

1. The Parties undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to use his or her surname (patronym) and first names in the minority language and the right to official recognition of them, according to modalities provided for in their legal system.
2. The Parties undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to display in his or her minority language signs, inscriptions and other information of a private nature visible to the public.
3. In areas traditionally inhabited by substantial numbers of persons belonging to a national minority, the Parties shall endeavor, in the framework of their legal system, including, where appropriate, agreements with other States, and taking into account their specific conditions, to display traditional local names, street names and other topographical indications intended for public also in the minority language when there is a sufficient demand for such indications.

Article 12

1. The Parties shall, where appropriate, take measures in the fields of education and research to foster knowledge of the culture, history, language and religion of their national minorities and of the majority.
2. In this context the Parties shall *inter alia* provide adequate opportunities for teacher training and access to textbooks, and facilitate contacts among students and teachers of different communities.
3. The Parties undertake to promote equal opportunities for access to education at all levels for persons belonging national minorities.

Article 13

1. Within the framework of their education systems, the Parties shall recognize that persons belonging to a national minority have the right to set up and to manage their own private educational and training establishments.
2. The exercise of this right shall not entail any financial obligation for the Parties.

Article 14

1. The Parties undertake to recognize that every person belonging to a national minority has the right to learn his or her minority language.
2. In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, if there is sufficient demand, the Parties shall endeavor to ensure, as far as possible and within the framework of their education systems, that persons belonging to those minorities have adequate opportunities for being taught the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language.
3. Paragraph 2 of this article shall be implemented without prejudice to the learning of the official language or the teaching in this language.

Article 15

The Parties shall create the conditions necessary for the effective participation of persons belonging to national minorities in cultural, social and economic life and in public affairs, in particular those affecting them.

Article 16

The Parties shall refrain from measures which alter the proportions of the population in areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities and are aimed at restricting the rights and freedoms flowing from the principles enshrined in the present framework Convention.

Article 17

1. The Parties undertake not to interfere with the right persons belonging to national minorities o establish and maintain free and peaceful contacts across frontiers with persons lawfully staying in other States, in particular those with whom they share an ethnic, cultural, linguistic or religious identity, or a common cultural heritage.
2. The Parties undertake not to interfere with the right of persons belonging to national minorities to participate in the activities of non-governmental organizations both at the national and international levels.

Article 18

1. The Parties shall endeavor to conclude, where necessary, bilateral and multilateral agreements with other States, in particular neighboring States, order to ensure the protection of persons belonging to national minorities concerned.
2. Where relevant, the Parties shall take measures to encourage transfrontier cooperation.

APPENDIX B*

TREATY OF LAUSANNE (Articles 37-45)

SECTION 3 - PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

Article 37

Turkey undertakes that the stipulations contained in Articles 38 to 44 shall be recognized as fundamental laws, and that no law, no regulation, nor official action shall conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor shall any law, regulation nor official action prevail over them.

Article 38

The Turkish Government undertakes to assure full and complete protection of life and liberty to all inhabitants of Turkey without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion.

All inhabitants of Turkey shall be entitled to free exercise, whether in public or private, of any creed, religion or belief, the observance of which shall no be incompatible with public order and good morals.

Non-Moslem minorities will enjoy full freedom of movement and emigration, subject to the measure applied, on the whole or on part of the territory, to all Turkish nationals, and which may be taken by the Turkish Government for national defense, or for the maintenance of public order.

Article 39

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities will enjoy the same civil and political rights as Moslems.

All the inhabitants of Turkey, without distinction of religion, shall be equal before law.

Differences of religion, creed or confession shall not prejudice any Turkish national in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil or political rights, as, for instance, admission to public employments, functions and honors, or the exercise of professions and industries.

No restrictions shall be imposed on the free use by any Turkish national of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, religion, in the press, or in publications of any kind or at public meetings.

Notwithstanding the exercise of he official language, adequate facilities shall be given to Turkish nationals of non-Turkish speech for the oral use of their own language before the Courts.

Article 40

* Lois Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Turks of Greece (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1990), pp. 47-50.

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities shall enjoy the same treatment and security in law and in fact as other Turkish nationals. In particular, they shall have an equal right to establish, manage and control at their own expense, any charitable, religious and social institutions, any schools and other establishments for instruction and education, with the right to use their own language and to exercise their own religion freely therein.

Article 41

As regards public instruction, the Turkish Government will grant in those towns and districts, where a considerable proportion of non-Moslem nationals are resident, adequate facilities for ensuring that in the primary schools the instruction shall be given to the children of such Turkish nationals through the medium of their own language. This provision will not prevent the Turkish Government from making the teaching of the Turkish language obligatory in the said schools.

In towns and districts where there is a considerable proportion of Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities, these minorities shall be assured an equitable share in the enjoyment and application of the sums which may be provided out of public funds under the State, municipal, or other budgets for educational, religious or charitable purposes.

The sums in question shall be paid to the qualified representatives of the establishments and institutions concerned.

Article 42

The Turkish Government undertakes to take, as regards non-Moslem minorities, in so far as concerns their family law or personal status, measures permitting the settlement of these questions in accordance with the customs of those minorities.

These measures will be elaborated by special Commissions composed of representatives of the Turkish Government and of representatives of each of the minorities concerned in equal number. In case divergence, the Turkish Government and the Council of the League of Nations will appoint in agreement an umpire chosen from amongst European lawyers.

The Turkish Government undertakes to grant full protection to the churches, synagogues, cemeteries, and other religious establishments of the above-mentioned minorities. All facilities and authorization will be granted to the pious foundations, and to the religious and charitable institutions of the said minorities at present existing in Turkey, and the Turkish Government will not refuse, for the formation of new religious and charitable institutions, any of the necessary facilities which are guaranteed to other private institutions of that nature

Article 43

Turkish nationals belonging to non-Moslem minorities shall not be compelled to perform any act which constitutes a violation of their faith and or religious observances, and shall not be placed under any disability by reason of their refusal to attend Courts of Law or to perform any legal business on their weekly day of rest.

This provision, however, shall not exempt such Turkish nationals from such obligations as shall be imposed upon all other Turkish nationals for the preservations of public order.

Article 44

Turkey agrees that, in so far as the preceding Articles of this Section affect non-Moslem nationals of Turkey, these provisions constitute obligations of international concern and shall be placed under the guarantee of the League of Nations. They shall not be modified without the assent of the majority of the Council of the League of

Nations. The British Empire, France, Italy and Japan hereby agree not to withhold their assent to any modification in these Articles which is in due form assented to by a majority of the Council of the League of Nations.

Turkey agrees that any Member of the Council of the League of Nations shall have the right to bring to the attention of the Council any infraction or danger of infraction of any of these obligations, and that the Council may thereupon take such action and give such directions as it may deem proper and effective in the circumstances.

Turkey further agrees that any difference of opinion as to questions of law or of fact arising out of these Articles between the Turkish Government and any one of the other Signatory Powers or any other Power, a member of the Council of the League of Nations, shall be held to be a dispute of an international character under Article 14 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Turkish Government hereby consents that any such dispute shall, if the other party thereto demands, be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The decision of the Permanent Court shall be final and shall have the same force and effect as an award under 13 of the Covenant.

Article 45

The rights conferred by the provisions of the present Section on the non-Moslem minorities of Turkey will be similarly conferred by Greece on the Moslem minority in her territory.

APPENDIX C*

TWO EMERGENCY ORDERS BY THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATOR OF THRACE

1) Translation

Kingdom of Greece
General Administration of Thrace
Interior Office
Number of Protocol A1043

Komotene, 27/12/1954
URGENT

TO: The Mayors and Presidents of the Communes of the Prefecture of Rhodope.

Following the order of the President the Government (Prime Minister) we ask you that from now on and in all occasions the terms “Turk - Turkish” are used instead of the terms “Muslim - of Muslim”.

The General Administrator of Thrace
G. Fessopoulos

2) Translation

Kingdom of Greece
General Administration of Thrace
Interior Office
Number of Protocol A202

Komotene, 5/2/1955

In spite of the strict orders of the government to replace the terms “Muslim - of Muslim” and use from now on the term “Turk - Turkish”, in the village of Aratos on the public road connecting Komotene and Alexandroupole there exists a very prominent sign with the words “Muslim School”.
It, as well as any other such signs that might exist in the area of the Prefecture of Rhodope, should be replaced immediately.

The General Administrator of Thrace
G. Fessopoulos

* Lois Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Turks of Greece (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1990), pp. 51-52. See *ibid.* for the Greek and Turkish versions of both documents.

APPENDIX D*

REPLY BY THE OFFICE OF TOWN-PLANNING OF THE PREFECTURE OF RHODOPE TO THE MANAGING COMMITTEE OF THE MUSLIM TEMPLE IN THE VILLAGE OF SEMBOLA

Translation

Komotene, 4/2/1985
Number of Protocol (not

The Hellenic Republic
legible)

Prefecture of Rhodope

Office: Office of Town-Planning and Town-Planning Projects

Post Office

Address: Administration Office

Information: Office of Permit Approvals

Telephone: 26582/381 ext.

To: Mr. Omer Hotza Raef

President of the Managing Committee of the Muslim Temple in the village of
Sembola,
Sembola

Also sent to: Athansios Koures, Civil Engineer, 7 Heroon Ave., Komotene

Re: The return of the planning file regarding restoration of the Muslim Temple in
Sembola. In relation to our letter with number of protocol 94755/??/14-9-1984.

Following up on the aforementioned letter with which we informed you of the deficiencies present in the planning file for the approval of the required permit, and given the application, under the same number, that you submitted presenting only the topographic diagram of the building plot, photographs and the form required by the statute 105/69, we return to you the file because even though a period of more than four (4) months has elapsed since our notification on that matter you failed to show the appropriate interest in completing the planning file with the necessary documents.

We also inform you that in the case you wish to reapply for the permit approval for the restoration of the Temple in Sembola the plan would have to be compiled according to the specifications of the Presidential Decree 3/9/1983 (FEK 394 D/8-9-83) and you must submit beyond the other documents also a) a detailed diagram of the building-plot and the nearby area b) detailed budget of the works according to ATOE c) titles of the property and recent titles of ownership and d) approval of the Holy Cathedral of Maronea - Komotene.

Enclosed: File to be returned.
(Architect 4)

Person in Charge: Stelios Matanas

* Lois Whitman, Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Turks of Greece (New York: Human Rights Watch, 1990), pp. 55 and 56. See *ibid.* for the original Greek version of the letter.

APPENDIX E*

A SELECTIVE LIST OF LANDS AND CEMETERIES EXPROPRIATED BY GREECE

IN XANTHI

1- Esma Haným barracks;

In 1936/1937, 40 acres of land, which was part of a 400 acres, was given to a Greek named Pandelakis, and later in 1950 the rest, 360 acres was possessed by Greeks without any notification and payment and distributed to the Greek peasants of Diomidia, Hamitli and Petinos - Horozlu to be used as fields.

2- Kelhasanađa Barracks;

In 1950 Greek Government expropriated this land without any warning or payment and distributed among Greeks of Hamitli and Horozlu villages.

3- Hamitli Barracks;

2500 acres of land on the west of the railway, half of the 5000 acres barrack land which belonged to 44 people on 15 deeds, has been passed on to the Greek government by the decision of a mixed exchange commission. These places have been given to the villagers of Lefki - Bekirli and Orman Mahalle in order to use land as fields.

4- Horozlular Barracks;

Belonged to 30 people, taken by Greeks in 1950.

5- In Koca Orman Narastanlı location 1500 acres of barrack land, field and forest belonging to Mustafa Papazade Ali Bey.

6- In Koca Orman Narastanlı location 1500 acres of barrack land field and forest belonging to Mehmet Bey Eminađa zade.

7- In Koca Orman Narastanlı region 3000 acres of barrack land, field and forest belonging to Demir Süleyman Ađaođu Ali Ađa.

8- 3000 acres of land which was originally left out of the mixed exchange commission decision to pass on to the Greek government, half of which situated by the sea, although belonged to the peasants of Yenice Tablýk Turkish village, are given to the Greeks.

9- 70 acres of land bought by the peasants of Yenice Boyacılar Turkish village in 1918-1920 from Koyunköylü Bugar Andoln and had the deed made out to three of them was passed on to the Greek government without any payments.

10- Since 1930 and during the following years, the maps drawn by Greeks show the deeded Turkish land as “meadows” and from 1945 the field belonging to the Turks have been gradually taken out of their possession without any notification or payment, the examples of there are in Feloni -Musfaklý, Koruköy, etc.

* How The Western Thrace Turks Are Annihilated (Batý Trakya Türkleri Dayanýpma Derneđi, 1976), pp. 14-18.

11- People who have been falsely accused of cooperating with the Bulgarians and Germans during 1941-1944 had their lands taken by the Greek government. The examples of these are in Kumçiftliði or Neo-Orestiasta 5000 acres land of Uskanlý farm which belonged to the heir of Mustafa Neyir.

12- In Dimetoka 20,000 acres of forest which belonged to contractor Yakup Efendi's son, Hüseyin Efendi was taken by the Greek government.

13- In Ehinós - Ðahin region, 30,000 acres of forest land which belonged to Hacı Deli Hasan Hüseyin was taken out of possession in the same way.

14- In Memkova 15,000 acres of forest belonged to Saitoðulları was taken by force of Greek government.

15- 1000 acres of land which belonged to 32 peasants from Vafeyla-Boyacýlar Turkish village have been taken by the Greek authorities in 1963 without any notification or payment and later distributed to the Greek peasants of the same village.

For the ownership of this land a legal case was won by the possessors, in the first court of Xanthi, before WW II.

16- In Noyabapý 1523 pieces of farming land have been taken from the Turks on the 8 September 1955.

17- In the Ferezler region 89 acres of land was taken away from the Turks.

IN KOMOTINI

1- In Iasmos - Yassiköy region forest, field and barracks land a total of 65000 acres belonging to the farm of Balabanköy - Dialimli together with 1000 acres of Kuruçay meadow, was taken by force in 1946 by the Greeks.

2- Later in 1952, these places were distributed to the Greeks. Land taken from the Turks by special law numbered 2185 in 1952.

3- In Pagurion - Bayatlý region 1337 acres of land belonging to the Büyük Kaval farm was taken by the Greeks, and only a piece of 315 acres was left to the owners.

4- From the same farm 2000 acres were taken without paying any compensation.

The Expropriated Turkish Farms in Komotini

5- Ýmaret farm: 30,000 acres

6- Murhan farm: 30,000 acres

7- Çuhacýlar farm: 3,000 acres

8- Songurlu farm: 5,000 acres

9- Rumbeyli farm: 5,000 acres

10- Kýrçiftliði farm: 20,000 acres

11- Kurtova farm: 22,000 acres

12- Küçükkaval farm: 12,000 acres

13- Büyükkaval farm: 18,000 acres

14- Anaköy farm: 30,000 acres

15- Yassýada farm: 3,000 acres

16- Kapýkçý farm: 1,500 acres

17- Cambaz farm: 30,000 acres

18- Otmanlý farm: 15,000 acres

19- Þýrldaňan farm: 6,000 acres

20- Yaygýn farm: 3,000 acres

21- Yardýmlý farm: 5,000 acres

22- Delnazköy farm: 3,000 acres.

CEMETERIES

IN XANTHI

Central Cemetery was expropriated by the government to build parks, market place and shops for the municipality.

Little Cemetery was turned into a park. Central Cemetery of Musfaklý and those of Okçular near the railway are turned into fields.

IN KOMOTINI

Namazgah Cemetery which covered 40 acres was taken by force, and a public park was built on the land with a dance floor and church in it.

Yedi Çaplý Cemetery covering 15 acres of land was taken by force to build municipality facilities.

Dedeler Karaađacı Cemetery of 50 acres was taken by force and a Christian high school was built on the land.

Postuboş Cemetery covering 50 acres was taken by force and on its place public stables were built.

Martyri Cemetery of 12 acres was turned into a park.

Çarþý Cemetery of 15 acres was destroyed to build banks and stock exchange markets on it.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Akalýn, Hakký. 1999. *Turkey & Greece: On the Way To Another War?* Ankara: Net Ofset.

Allen, Tim and John Eade (eds.) 1999. *Divided Europeans: Understanding Ethnicities in Conflict*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Allison, Graham T. and Kalipso Nikolaydis (eds.) 1999. *Yunan Paradoksu* (The Greek Paradox). Bülent Tanatar, trans. Ýstanbul: Dođan Publications.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Bataille, Philippe and *et al.* (sous la direction de Michel Wieviorka). 1994. *Racisme et Xénophobie en Europe: Une Comparaison Internationale* (Racism and Xenophobia in Europe: An International Comparison). Paris: Editions La Découverte.

Benlisoy, Yorgo and Elçin Macar. *Fener Patrikhanesi* (The Phanar Patriarchate). Ankara: Ayraç Publishing House.

Bröllmann, Cathrine and *et al.* (eds.) 1993. *Peoples and Minorities in International Law*. The Hague: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Burn, Andrew Robert. 1988. *The Pelican History of Greece*. London: Penguin Books.

Bury, J. B. and Russell Meiggs. 1975. *A History of Greece*. London: Macmillan Press.

Carabott, Philippe (ed.) 1997. *Greek Society in the Making, 1863-1913: Realities, Symbols and Visions*. Aldershot: Ashgate-Variorum.

Cartledge, Paul. 1993. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Christie, Kenneth (ed.) 1998. *Ethnic Conflict, Tribal Politics: A Global Perspective*. Surrey: Curzon Press.

- Claude, Inis L. 1969. *National Minorities: An International Problem*. Westport: Greenwood Press, Publishers.
- Clogg, Richard. 1992. *A Concise History of Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coleman, John E. and Clark A. Walz (eds.) 1997. *Greeks and Barbarians: Essays on the Interactions Between Greeks in Antiquity and the Consequences for Eurocentricism*. Maryland: CDL Press.
- Constantelos, Demetrios J. 1996. *The Greeks: Their Heritage and Its Value Today*. Massachusetts: Hellenic College Press.
- Constantopoulou, Photini (ed.) 1999. *The Foundation of the Modern Greek State: Major Treaties and Conventions (1830-1947)* - Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece, Service of Historical Archives. Athens: Kastaniotis Editions.
- Cozic, Charles P. (ed.) 1994. *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press.
- Crawford, James. 1992. *The Rights of Peoples*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cunliffe, Barry. 1988. *Greeks, Romans and Barbarians: Spheres of Interaction*. New York: Methuen.
- Cuthbertson, Ian M. and Jane Leibowitz (eds.) 1993. *Minorities: The New Europe's Old Issue*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Cvijic, Jovan. 1918. *La Péninsule Balkanique: Géographie Humaine* (Balkan Peninsula: Human Geography). Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.
- Delanty, Gérard. 1995. *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Demirtaş-Copkun, Birgül. 2001. *The Vlachs: A Forgotten Minority in the Balkans*. London: Frank Cass.
- Documents Sur Les Atrocités Grecques: Atrocités Grecques en Macedoine (Documents on Greek Atrocities: Greek Atrocities in Macedonia). 1913. Sophia: Imprimerie de l'Etat.
- Elazar, Daniel J. and *et al.* (eds.) 1984. *The Balkan Jewish Communities*. Lanham: University of America Press.
- Eriksen, Thomas Hylland. 1997. *Ethnicity & Nationalism: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Erksan, Metin. 1999. *Mare Nostrum - Bizim Deniz - Yunan Sorunu* (Mare Nostrum - Our Sea - The Greek Question). İstanbul: Hil Publications.

Fridlitzius, Sandro and Abby Peterson. 1996. *Stranger or Guest? Racism and Nationalism in Contemporary Europe*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International.

Garcia, Soledad (ed.) 1993. *European Identity and the Search for Legitimacy*. London: Pinter.

Gillespie, Richard (ed.) 1994. *Mediterranean Politics*, vol I. London: Pinter.

-----, 1996. *Mediterranean Politics*, vol II. London: Pinter.

Gomien, Donna (ed.) 1993. *Broadening the Frontiers of Human Rights: Essays in Honour of Asbjörn Eide*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press.

Hall, Jonathan M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hamilton, Kimberley and Robert E. Hunter (eds.) *Migration and the New Europe*. Washington D.C: The Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Hatipoğlu, Murat. 1999. *Yunanistan'da Etnik Gruplar ve Azınlıklar* (Ethnic Groups and Minorities in Greece). Ankara: National Committee of Strategic Research and Studies.

-----, 1999. *The Moslem Turks and Slavo-Macedonians of Greece: Denying Ethnic Identities in a Balkan State*. Ankara: Ofset.

Hazekamp, Jan Laurens and Keith Popple (eds.) 1997. *Racism in Europe: A Challenge for Youth Policy and Youth Work*. London: UCL Press Limited.

Henrard, Kristin. 2000. *Devising an Adequate System of Minority Protection*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Hýdyroglou, Paul. 1991. *The Greek Pomaks and Their Relation With Turkey*. Athens: Proskinio.

Holden, David. 1972. *Greece Without Columns: The Making of Modern Greeks*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Hutchinson, John and Anthony D. Smith (eds.) 2000. *Nationalism: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, 5 vols, London: Routledge.

-----, 1996. *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

International Affairs Agency. 1992. *The Turkish Dossier - The Western Thrace Turks Issue In Turkish Greek Relations*. Ýstanbul: n.p

Ivanov, Andrey. 1996. *The Balkans Divided: Nationalism, Minorities and Security*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang GmbH.

Jardé, Auguste François. 1996. *The Formation of the Greek People*. M. R. Dobie, trans. London: Routledge.

Jelavich, Charles and Barbara. 1977. *The Establishment of the Balkan National States, 1804-1920*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Joly, Daniele (ed.) 1998. *Scapegoats and Actors: The Exclusion and Integration of Minorities in Western and Eastern Europe*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

-----, Clive Netton, and Hugh Poulton (eds.) 1992. *Refugees: Asylum in Europe?* London: Minority Rights Publications.

Kayýhan, Ahmet. 1967. *Lozan ve Batý Trakya* (Lausanne and Western Thrace). Ýstanbul: Türkiye Publishing House.

Kly, Y. N. 1997. *Societal Development - Minority Rights*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.

Kourvetaris, Yorgos A. and Betty A Dobratz. 1987. *A Profile of Modern Greece: In Search of Identity*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kourvetaris, George A. 1999. *Studies on Modern Greek Society and Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kupchan, Charles A. (ed.) 1995. *Nationalism and Nationalities in the New Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ladas, Stephen. 1932. *The Exchange of Minorities: Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Larkin, LaRae. 1996. *The Legitimacy in International Law of the Detention and Internment of Aliens and Minorities in the Interest of National Security*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Leca, Jean (ed.) 1998. *Uluslar ve Milliyetçilikler* (Nations and Nationalisms). Siren Ýdemen, trans. Ýstanbul: Metis.

Legg, Keith R. and John M. Roberts. 1997. *Modern Greece: A Civilization on the Periphery*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Loring, Danforth M. 1995. *The Macedonian Conflict: Ethnic Nationalism in a Transnational World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lütem, Ömer E. and Birgül Demirtaþ-Copkun (eds.) 2001. *Balkan Diplomasisi* (Balkan Diplomacy). Ankara: Eurasia Strategic Research Center Publications.

Maccas, Léon. 1921. *La Question Gréco-Albanaise* (The Greco-Albanian Question). Nancy: Berger-Levrault.

MacDonald, Sharon (ed.) 1993. *Inside European Identities*. Oxford: Berg.

- Mackenzie, Molly. 1992. *Turkish Athens: The Forgotten Centuries - 1456-1832*. Berkshire: Ithaca Press.
- Mackridge, Peter and Eleni Yannadakis (eds.) 1997. *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg.
- Mansel, Arif Müfid. 1938. *Trakya'nın Kültür ve Tarihi* (Culture and History of Thrace). İstanbul: Resimli Ay Publishing House.
- Martiniello, Marco. 1994. *Migration, Citizenship and Ethno-National Identities in the European Union*. Vermont: Avebury.
- McInerney, Jeremy. 1999. *Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis: the Folds of Parnassos*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Memişoğlu, Hüseyin. 1991. *Pomak Türklerinin Geçmişinden Sayfalar* (Pages From the History of Pomak Turks). Ankara: İsfak.
- Miall, Hugh (ed.) 1994. *Minority Rights in Europe: The Scope for a Transnational Regime*. London: Pinter.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Republic of Turkey. 1999. Ethnic Albanians in Greece. Ankara: n.p.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Republic of Turkey. 1999. Macedonian Minority in Greece. Ankara: n.p.
- Minority Rights Group. 1990. *World Directory of Minorities*. Illinois: St. James Press.
- Moscovici, Serge, Gabriel Mugny, and Eddy Van Avermaet (eds.) 1985. *Perspectives on Minority Influence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudimbe, V. Y. (ed.) 1997. *Nations, Identities, Cultures*. London: Duke University Press.
- Müllerson, Rein. 1994. *International Law, Rights and Politics: Developments in Eastern Europe and the CIS*. London: Routledge.
- Neuwahl, Nanette and Allan Rosas (eds.) 1995. *The European Union and Human Rights*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
- Oran, Baskın. 1986. *Türk-Yunan İlişkilerinde Batı Trakya Sorunu* (The Issue of Western Thrace in Turkish-Greek Relations). Ankara: Foundation of Mülkiyeliler Union.

Ortaylý, Ýlber. 2000. *Osmanlý Ýmparatorluđu'nda Ýktisadi ve Sosyal Deđiřim - Makaleler I* (Economic and Social Change in the Ottoman Empire - Articles I). Ankara: Turhan Publishing House.

Öznel, Erdođan. 1993. *Makedonya Yunan Deđildir* (Macedonia is Not Greek). Ankara: Publications of the Chief-of-Staff of the Republic of Turkey.

Panayi, Panikos. 2000. *An Ethnic History of Europe Since 1945*. Essex: Longman.

Pettifer, James. 1993. *The Greeks*. London: Viking.

Poulton, Hugh. 1995. *Who Are The Macedonians?* London: Hurst & Company.

-----, 1991. *The Balkans: Minorities and States in Conflict*. London: Minority Rights Publications.

Raif, K. B. 1995. *Greeks - The Democrats Who Are Not*. Ankara: Turkish Democracy Foundation.

Republic of Turkey, General Directorate of Press, Publication and Information of the Prime Ministry. 1990. *Dýp Basýnda Batý Trakya Olaylary* (Western Thrace Issues ýn Foreign Press). Ankara: n.p.

Rex, John and Beatrice Drury (eds.) 1996. *Ethnic Mobilization in a Multi-Cultural Europe*. Ipswich: Ipswich Book Co Ltd.

Ricks, David and Paul Magdalino. 1998. *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Ryan, Stephen. 1990. *Ethnic Conflict and International Relations*. Vermont: Dartmouth.

Sakellariou, M. B. (ed.) 1983. *Greek Lands In History: Macedonia - 4000 Years of Greek History and Civilization*. Athens: Ekdotike Ellados S. A.

Saybařýlý, Kemali and Gencer Özcan (eds.) 1997. *Yeni Balkanlar, Eski Sorunlar...* (New Balkans, Old Problems...). Ýstanbul: Bađlam Publications.

Shore, Cris. 2000. *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London: Routledge.

Silverstein, Michael and Greg Urban (eds.) 1996. *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: the University of Chicago Press.

Simons, Walter. 1931. *International Public Law in Europe: The Evolution of International Public Law in Europe Since Grotius*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Smith, Paul (ed.) 1991. *Ethnic Groups in International Relations: Comparative Studies on Governments and non-Dominant Ethnic Groups in Europe, 1850-1940*, vol. V. Dartmouth: New York University Press.

Smith, Anthony D. 1999. *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-----, 2000. *The Nation in History: Historical Debates About Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Hanover: University Press of New England.

----- (ed.) 1992. *Ethnicity and Nationalism*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Sönmezoğlu, Faruk (ed.) 1998. *Türk Dış Politikasının Analizi* (Analysis of Turkish Foreign Policy). İstanbul: Der Publications.

-----, 2000. *Türkiye-Yunanistan İlişkileri & Büyük Güçler: Kıbrıs, Ege ve Diğer Sorunlar* (Turco-Greek Relations and Great Powers: Cyprus, Aegean and Other Issues). İstanbul: Der Publications.

Spiliopoulou-Akermark, Athanastasia. 1997. *Justifications of Minority Protection in International Law*. London: Kluwer Law International.

Stanford, Edward (ed.). 1877. *Carte Ethnologique de la Turquie D'Europe et de la Grece* (Ethnological Map of Turkey in Europe and Greece). Paris: Palais Royal.

Suksi, Markku (ed.) 1998. *Autonomy: Applications and Implications*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Bahin, Mustafa. 2000. *Avrupa Birliği'nin Self-Determinasyon Politikası* (Self Determination Policy of the European Union). Ankara: Nobel Publishing and Distribution Ltd.

Bımpir, Bilal. 1968. *Emigrations Turques des Balkans: Documents*, vol I (Emigration of Balkan Turks: Documents, vol I). Ankara: Ayyıldız Publishing House.

-----, 1970. *Emigrations Turques des Balkans: Documents*, vol II (Emigration of Balkan Turks: Documents, vol II). Ankara: Ayyıldız Publishing House.

Thranhardt, Dietrich (ed.) 1992. *Europe - A New Immigration Continent: Policies and Politics in Comparative Perspective*. Münster: Lit.

Thornberry, Patrick. 1991. *International Law and the Rights of Minorities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Toynbee, Arnold. 1954. *Asia and Europe, Facts and Fantasies, In a Study of History*. London: Oxford University Press.

Turkish Minority in Greece - Greek Minority in İstanbul. (author, publication date and place not printed.)

Vakalopoulos, Apostolos E. 1970. *Origins of The Greek Nation: The Byzantine Period, 1204-1461*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Vaner, Semih (ed.) 1990. *Türk-Yunan Uyuşmazlığı* (The Turco-Greek Dispute). İstanbul: Metis.

de Varennes, Ferdinand. 1996. *Language, Minorities and Human Rights*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.

Veinstein, Gilles (ed.) 1993. *Salonique 1850-1918: La "Ville des Juifs" et le Réveil des Balkans* (Thessaloniki 1850-1918: The "City of Jews" and The Awakening of the Balkans). Paris: Editions Autrement.

Waeber, Ole and *et al.* (eds.) 1993. *Identity, Migration and the New Security Agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter.

Western Thrace Turks Solidarity Association Center. 1989. *Dr. Sadık Ahmet'in Pahsında Batı Trakya Türkleri Yargılanıyor* (Western Thrace Turks Are Being Tried In the Name of Dr. Sadık Ahmet). İstanbul: n.p.

Western Thrace Turks Solidarity Association Center. 1976. *How Western Thrace Turks Are Annihilated*. İstanbul: n.p.

Whitman, Lois. 1990. *Destroying Ethnic Identity: The Turks of Greece, A Helsinki Watch Report*. New York: Human Rights Watch.

Wicker, Hans-Rudolf (ed.) 1997. *Rethinking Nationalism and Ethnicity: The Struggle for Meaning and Order in Europe*. Oxford: Berg.

Woodhouse, C. M. 1991. *Modern Greece: A Short History*. London: Faber and Faber.

Yücel, Celalettin. 1976. *Dış Türkler* (Turks Outside Turkey). İstanbul: Hun.

ARTICLES FROM BOOKS, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, NEWS AGENCIES AND THE INTERNET

Alexanderson, Martin. 1997. "Why the Framework Convention Should be Ratified," in *Mare Balticum* 3: 21-23, on www.riga.lv/minelres/publicat/Alexan_1.htm

Apostolou, Mario. 1996. "The Pomaks: A Religious Minority in the Balkans," on http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/iec/iec03/iec03_14_96.html

Baldwin-Edward, Martin and Constantina Satilios-Rothschild. 1993. "Immigration and Unemployment in Greece: Perceptions and Realities," in *South European Society and Politics* 4(3): 206-221.

“Batý Trakya Olayları,” (“Western Thrace Issues”) in *Batý Trakya* (Western Thrace) 23(258): 49-69.

“Batý Trakya Türkleri’nin Lideri Dr. Sadýk Ahmet’in 29 Ocak’la Ýlgili Olarak Yayýnladýđý Mesaj,” (“Message on 29 January by Dr. Sadýk Ahmet, Leader of Western Thrace Turks”) in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 38: 3.

Carabott, Philip. 1997. “The Politics of Assimilation vis-à-vis the Slavo-Macedonian Minority of Interwar Greece: From Parliamentary Inertia to Metaxist Repression.” In Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis, eds., *Ourselfs and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg, 59-78.

Carras, Costa. “Identity,” on www.fitzrodearborn.com.engreece.htm

“The Catholic Church in Greece,” on <http://www.interkriti.net/ccc/004.htm>

“The Cham Issue is Still a Taboo For Greece,” on <http://www.turk-yunan.gen.tr/english/minority/index.html>

“Council of Europe Finds Racism in Greece,” on <http://www.eurasianet.org/resource/regional/ihf-greece.html>

December 1999. “Simitis, Pandora’s Box,” on <http://www.turk-yunan.gen.tr/english/minority/index.html>

Demertzis, Nicolas and *et al.* 1999. “Media and Nationalism: The Macedonian Question,” in *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics* 4(3): 26-30, on www.jhupress.edu/home.html

Dimitras, Panayote Elias. 1998. “Greece’s Hate Media Breed Popular Hate Culture,” AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

----- 1998. “Pangalos, the Torch-Bearer of the Greek Consensus Against National Minorities,” AIM Athens, on <http://www.greekhelsinki.ge/english/AIM26-12-98.html>

----- 2000. “Writing and Rewriting History in the Context of Balkan Nationalisms,” in *Southeast European Politics* 1(1): 41-59.

----- 2001. “Greece’s Anti-Minority Attitude,” AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

Doumas, Panayotis. 2001. “A Victory For The Greek Pomaks,” on http://www.egrammes.gr/2001/07/pomaks_en.htm

“European Commission Asks For More Information About Conviction of Greek Language Activist,” on <http://www.aromanian.net>

February? “Yunanistan’da Makedon Azýnlýk Sorunu,” (“The Macedonian Minority Problem in Greece”) in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 47: 15.

Finley, Moses. 1996. “The Ancient Greeks and Their Nation.” In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 111-116.

Fleming, F. E. 2000. “Athens, Constantinople, “Istambol”: Urban Paradigms and Nineteenth - Century Greek National Identity,” in *New Perspectives on Turkey* 22: 1-23.

Fossum, Jon Erik. 2001. “Identity-Politics in the European Union,” ARENA Working Papers, on http://arena.uio.no/publications/wp01_17htm

Froats, Daniel T. 1996. “The Emergence and Selective Enforcement of International Minority-Rights Protections After the Cold War,” in *MacArthur Consortium Working Papers in Peace and Cooperation*, on Columbia International Affairs Online, <http://www.ciaonet.org>

Gal, Kinga. 2000. “The Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and Its Impact on Central and Eastern Europe,” in *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, on <http://ecmi.de>

Goldberg, Hannah. 2000. “On Anti-Semitism in Greece,” AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

Gounaris, Basil C. 1997. “Reassessing Ninety Years of Greek Historiography on the Struggle for Macedonia 1904-1908.” In Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis, eds., *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg, 25-37.

Goussetis, Dionyssis. 2000. “National Identity and Civil Society in Greece,” AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

“Greece,” on <http://www.axt.org.uk/antisem/archive/archive2/greece/greece.htm>

“Greece: Racially Motivated Arson in a Roma Hut in Nea Kios,” on <http://www.eurasianet.org/resource/regional/ihf-greece.htm>

Güçlü, Ramazan. 1990. “Trakya Müslümanları ve Atina Devleti,” (Thracian Muslims and the Greek State) in *Batý Trakya* (Western Thrace) 24(261): 5-8.

Haksas, Mehmet. 1988. “Pomak Türkleri’nde Soyadları,” in *Batý Trakya’nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 6: 34.

Hall, Derek. 1996. “Recent Developments in Greek-Albanian Relations.” In Richard Gillespie, ed., *Mediterranean Politics*, vol. II. London: Pinter, 82-104.

Hill, Peter. 1999. “Macedonians in Greece and in Albania: A Comparative Study of Recent Developments,” in *Nationalities Papers* 27 (1): 17-30.

Heraklides, Alexis. 2000. "Greeks and Albanians in Greece," AIM Athens, 2000, on www.aimpress.org

-----, 1997. "Ethnicity, Secessionist Conflict and The International Society: Towards Normative Paradigm Shift," in *Nations and Nationalism* 4(4): 493-520.

Ýnan, Yüksel. 1990. "Aren't There Any Turks In Western Thrace?," in *Dýp Politika/Foreign Policy* 14(1-2): 77-88.

January 15, 1988. "Ýskeçe Müftüsü'nün Ýsyaný," ("Mufti of Xanthi Protests") in *Batý Trakya'nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 249: 23.

January 1992. "Dr. Sadýk Ahmet'in Dokunulmazlýđý Kaldýrýlmak Ýsteniyor," ("Dr. Sadýk Ahmet's Immunity Subject to be Abolished") in *Batý Trakya'nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 38: 4.

Kapllani, Gazmend. 2000. "Albanian Municipal Elections and Emigrants in Greece," AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

Kentrotis, Kyriakos. 1994. "Echoes From The Past: Greece and Macedonian Controversy." In *Mediterranean Politics*, vol I. London: Pinter, 85-103.

Kitromilides, Pascalis. 1996. "'Balkan Mentality': History, Legend, Imagination," in *Nations and Nationalism* 2(2): 163-191.

-----, 1996. "Orthodoxy and Nationalism." In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Ethnicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 202-208.

-----, 2000. "'Imagined Communities' and The Origins of the National Question in the Balkans." In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Nationalism*, vol. II. London: Routledge, 645-683.

Koliopoulos, John S. 1997. "The War Over the Identity and Numbers of Greece's Slav Macedonians." In Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis, eds., *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg, 39-57.

Kuzio, Taras. 2001. "'Nationalising States' or Nation-Building? A Critical Review of the Theoretical Literature and Empirical Evidence," in *Nations and Nationalism* 7(2): 135-154.

Lewkowicz, Bea. 1994. "'Greece Is My Home But...': Ethnic Identity of Greek Jews in Thessaloniki," in *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 4(2): 225-240.

March 1992. "Din Adamlarý Batý Trakya'ya Yine Alýnmadý," ("Clergy Denied Entrance in Western Thrace Again") 40: 5.

March 1992. "İsmarlama Kitaba Protesto," ("Protest Against Ordered Books") *Batý Trakya'nýn Sesi* 40: 4.

Milo, Paskal. 1997. "Constitutional Rights and Minorities in the Balkans: A Comparative Analysis," in *Perceptions* 2(3), on <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/grupa/percept/113/113-2.html>

Nakratzas, Giorgios. 2001. "Greek Nationalism Proposal Fuels Balkan Nationalism," on http://www.florina.org/html/2001/2001-fueling_nationalism_html#

Nelson, Steven D. 14 April 2001. "Comparing Aromanian, Bosniak, Macedonian and Roma - Late or Failed - Nation-Building in the Balkans," on AIM Athens, <http://www.aimpress.org/dyn/trae/archive/data/200104/10414-002-trae.ath.htm>

Oran, Baskýn. 1996. "Batý Trakya'daki Müslüman - Türk Azýnlýđý" ("Muslim - Turkish Minority in Western Thrace"). In Semih Vaner, ed., *Türk Yunan Uyuþmazlýđý* (Turco-Greek Dispute). Ýstanbul: Metis, 152-168.

-----, 1998. "Türk Dýþ Politikasýnýn Analizi ve Batý Trakya" ("Analysis of Turkish Foreign Policy and Western Thrace"). In Faruk Sönmezođlu, ed., *Türk Dýþ Politikasýnýn Analizi* (Analysis of Turkish Foreign Policy). Ýstanbul: Der Publications, 307-320.

Özönder, Cihat. 1988-1989. "Balkanlar'da Yokedilmeye Çalýþýlan Bir Millet: Makedonlar," ("A Nation Contested Against to be Wiped Out in the Balkans") in *Batý Trakya'nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 7-8: 39-42.

-----, 1994. "Pomak Türkleri," ("Pomak Turks") in *Batý Trakya'nýn Sesi* (Voice of Western Thrace) 4: 16-19.

Papanikolatos, Nafsika. 1999. "Minorities: Sacrificial Lamb At Greek Democracy's Silver Jubilee," AIM Athens, on www.aimpress.org

Perdurant, Daniel. "Anti-Semitism in Contemporary Greek Society," on <http://www-jcd/acta.html>

Petrovich, Michael B. 2000. "Religion and Ethnicity in Eastern Europe." In John Hutchinson and Anthony D. Smith, eds., *Nationalism*, vol IV. London: Routledge, 1356-1381.

Phillips, Alan. 1995. "Minority Rights In Europe," on www.geocities.com/Athens/Delphi/6509/Warwick.htm

"Pomaks," on <http://www.turkses.com/culture/Pomak-eng/pomak-genis.htm>

Poulton, Hugh. 1996. "Ethnic Turks and Muslims in the Balkans and Cyprus: Turkey as a 'Kin-state' in the Eastern Mediterranean." In Richard Gillespie, ed., *Mediterranean Politics*, vol II. London: Pinter, 105-117.

Preston, Ryan. 1997. "The Religious Dimension of 'Popular Proto-Nationalism' in Modern Greece," on <http://www.hri.org/opr/Summer97/story3.html>

Rougheri, Christina. 1998. "Traditional Greek Nationalism Breeds New Display of Intolerance," on www.aimpress.org

Smith, Helena. 2000. "The Misery of Being Greek," on <http://www.albnet.com/pipermail/albsa-info/2000-August/000495.html>

Tong, Diane. 1992. "Photographing Gypsies," in *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 2(1): 98-100.

Triandafyllidou, A. and *et al.* 1997. "New Greek Nationalism," in *Sociological Research Online* 2 (2), on <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/2/1/7.html>

Tsoukalas, Constantine. 1999. "European Modernity and Greek National Identity," in *Journal of Southern Europe and the Balkans* 1(1): 7-14.

Tzilivakis, Kathy. "Non-Orthodox Christians Have Complaints About Greek Church," on <http://athensnews.gr>

Veremis, Thanos. 1997. "The Revival of the 'Macedonian' Question, 1991-1995." In Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis, eds., *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg, 228-234.

"The Vlachs," on www.greekhelsinki.gr/bhr/english/index/html

Voutina, Eftihia. 1997. "Population Transfers and Resettlement Policies in Inter-War Europe: The Case of Asia Minor Refugees in Macedonia From an International and National Perspective." In Peter Mackridge and Eleni Yannadakis, eds., *Ourselves and Others: The Development of a Greek Macedonian Cultural Identity Since 1912*. Oxford: Berg, 111-131.

Weiss Liberles, Adina. 1984. "The Jewish Community in Greece." In Daniel Elazar *et al.* eds., *The Balkan Jewish Communities*. Lanham: University of America Press, 102-126.

Yagcioglu, Dimostenis. 1996. "Irredentism: An Inevitable Tendency of Ethnic Nationalism," on www.geocities.com/Athens/8945/#selection

Yýldýz, Selahattin. "Müftülük Sorunu," ("The Question of Muftis") in *Batý Trakya* (Western Thrace) 24(261): 62-63.

-----, "Yunanistan Hükümeti'nin Gaspettiđi Türk Topraklarına Dair Rapor," ("Report on the Turkish Lands Confiscated by the Greek Government") in *Batý Trakya* (Western Thrace) 22(254): 3-8.

Zahariadis, Nikolaos. 1994. "Nationalism and Small State Foreign Policy: The Greek Response to the Macedonian Issue," in *Political Science Quarterly* 109(4): 647-668, on <http://www.hri.org/Macedonian-Heritage.downloads/library/Zach9904.pdf>

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Arşiv Belgelerine Göre Balkanlar'da ve Anadolu'da Yunan Mezalimi, (Greek Brutality in the Balkans and Anatolia in Documents) vols. I & II, Ankara: Republic of Turkey, General Directorate of State Archives of the Prime Ministry, Head Office of Ottoman Archives, 1995-1996.

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice, Department of Public Information, New York, UN, 1997

Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly, EREC 1201. WP, 1403-1/2/93-17-E

European Commission Against Racism and Intolerance: Second Report on Greece, on <http://www.turkses.com>

Human Rights Watch World Report 2002: Greece, on <http://turkses.com>

Point de Vue du Gouvernement de la République Turque sur L'Affaire de L'Interprétation de L'Article 2 de la Convention Concernant L'Echange des Populations Turques et Grecques, Signée A Lausanne le 30 Janvier 1923, (Opinion of the Government of the Republic of Turkey on the Interpretation of Article 2 of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations, Signed in Lausanne on 30 January 1923).

Report About Compliance With the Principles of the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, by Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM) and Minority Rights Group - Greece (MRG - G), on www.greekhelsinki.gr/minorities-of-Greece.html

Report on Greece to the OSCE Review Conference 1999, on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>

Statement to the 2001 OSCE Implementation Meeting Working Session on 'Rule of Law, 18 September 2001, Greece: Unfair Treatment of Migrants and Minorities', on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>

Statement to the 2001 OSCE Implementation Meeting Working Session on 'Roma', 20 September 2001, on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr>

United Nations Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/384

United Nations Document E/EN.4/sub.2/1985/31

United Nations Economic and Social Council Report E/CN.4/1998/6, 22 January 1998, on <http://www.unhcr.ch>

United Nations General Assembly Report A/51/542/Add. 1, 7 November 1996, on <http://www.unhcr.ch>

United States of America Congressional Record Proceedings and Debates of the 107th Congress, First Session, 147(0), Washington, 21 March 2001, on www.csce.gov.crs

United States of America Department of State Country Reports on Human Rights Practices - 2000: Greece, on www.state.gov

PRESS RELEASES

Press Release by the Political Secretariat of Rainbow, Florina-Lerin, 11 October 1999, on <http://www.florina.org>

Press Release by 3 Minority Deputies and 28 Minority Organizations and NGOs on the Occasion of the Universal Day Against Racism (21 March), 19 March 1999, on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/pressrelease.htm>

Press Release by Greek Helsinki Monitor, on <http://www.greekhelsinki.gr/english/pressrelease/9-11-00.htm>

UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Erdođan, Birsen. 1997. "The Protection of Minorities in International Law Up To 1990: The League of Nations and the United Nations System." Unpublished Master's thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University.

Çaðaptay, Soner. 1995. "Balkan Minorities and Their Effect Upon Balkan Security." Unpublished Master's thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University.

NEWSPAPERS AND NEWS AGENCIES

Associated Press

Athens News

BBC

Economicos Tachydromos

Eleftheros Typos

Eleftherotypia

The Guardian

Hürriyet

Kathimerini

Libération

Milliyet

Reuters

Shotos

Ta Nea

To Vima

Yeni Pafak

Zaman

A SELECTIVE LIST OF WEB SITES

Web site of College of Behavioral and Social Sciences at the University of Maryland College Park; www.bsos.umd.edu

Web site of the European Union; www.europa.eu.int

Web site of Columbia International Affairs Online; www.ciao.net

Web site of Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers; www.fitzroydearborn.com

Web site of Michigan State University Libraries; www.lib.msu.edu

Web site of “The Cyprus Conflict”; www.cyprus-conflict.net

Web site of Sociological Research Online; www.socresonline.org.uk

Web site of Alternativna Informativna Mreza (Alternative Information Network); www.aimpress.org

Web site of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Turkey; www.mfa.gov.tr

Web site of Macedonian Political Party in Greece - RAINBOW; www.florina.org

Balkan Human Rights web pages; www.greekhelsinki.gr

Web site of Commission of Security and Cooperation in Europe; www.csce.gov

Web site of United Nations High Commission of Refugees; www.unhcr.ch

Web site of The Voice of Turks; www.turkses.com

Web site of US Department of State; www.state.gov

Web site of Hellenic Resources Network; www.hri.org

Web site of Johns Hopkins University; www.jhu.edu

Web site of “Turkish Greek Relations, Disputes and Comments”; www.turk-yunan.gen.tr

Web site of Central Asia - Caucasus News; www.eurasianet.org

Web site of “Antisemitism and Xenophobia Today”; www.axt.org.uk

Web site of Albanians in Macedonia Crisis Center; www.alb-net.com

Web site of Kathimerini; www.ekathimerini.com

Web site of Advanced Research on the Europeanisation of Nation-State (ARENA Working Papers); www.arena.uio.no